UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/257
25 July 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH/
RUSSIAN/SPANISH

Forty-ninth session
Item 145 of the provisional agenda*

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	4
II.	REPLIES RECEIVED FROM MEMBER STATES	4
	ALGERIA	4
	ARGENTINA	7
	BELARUS	8
	CUBA	9
	ECUADOR	10
	GREECE (on behalf of the European Union)	11
	INDIA	12
	MALTA	13
	MONACO	14
	NAMIBIA	14

* A/49/150.

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

POLAND 15

SAN MARINO 18

SWEDEN (on behalf of the Nordic countries) 18

TUNISIA 19

TURKEY 21

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 22

Annex. State, as at 20 June 1994, of signatures of, and ratifications of, accessions to or successions to, international conventions relating to various aspects of the problem of international terrorism 24

A. Conventions in respect of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations performs depository functions 24

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973 24

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979 27

B. Conventions in respect of which the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency or some Member States perform depository functions 29

1. Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963 29

2. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 34

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971 40

4. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980 47

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 24 February 1988 52

6. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 56

7. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 59

8. Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection, signed at Montreal on 1 March 1991 . 62

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 9 December 1993, the General Assembly, adopted decision 48/411, entitled "Measures to eliminate international terrorism". The present report is submitted pursuant to that decision.

2. By a note dated 24 January 1994, the Secretary-General, in accordance with paragraph (a) of decision 48/411, invited Member States to communicate to him their views on the proposals submitted by Governments contained in his report (A/48/267 and Corr.1 and Add.1) or made during the debate on this item in the Sixth Committee at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly or contained in General Assembly resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991 on practical measures to eliminate acts of terrorism, on ways and means of enhancing the role of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in combating international terrorism and on ways to consider this question within the Sixth Committee.

3. The present report reproduces the replies received from Member States as at 15 July 1994. Any additional replies that are received will be published in addenda to the present report.

II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM MEMBER STATES

ALGERIA

[Original: French]

[27 May 1994]

1. By adopting decision 48/411 on 9 December 1993, the United Nations General Assembly undoubtedly gave new impetus to the study of international terrorism, clearly demonstrating its wish to break with the repetitiveness and sterility of previous resolutions. Indeed, by that decision, together with the statement by the Chairman of the Sixth Committee prior to the adoption of decision 48/411 (see A/48/PV.73, p. 13), and by its resolution 48/122 of 20 December 1993, entitled "Human rights and terrorism", the General Assembly reiterated its condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism and urged the international community to enhance cooperation in the fight against all terrorist activity. Moreover, by its decision 48/411, the Assembly turned its attention towards "practical measures to eliminate acts of terrorism".

2. In so doing, the General Assembly unambiguously advocated an operational approach based on the adoption of concrete measures and actions capable of promoting effectual, effective international cooperation and tightening the network of international legal assistance and mutual support made indispensable by the organized internationalization of terrorist activities. This juridical and rational approach, which politico-doctrinal ideas and controversies have consciously or unconsciously scuttled for some 20 years, makes it essential to benefit from the experience of the United Nations in this area. This experience clearly reveals the need to abandon an ideological view of the phenomenon of terrorism, a view whose limits are abundantly evident at the level of both the

definition and the search for the causes underlying international terrorism matters which, moreover, do not fall within the province of the United Nations International Law Commission. To give substance to their unequivocal condemnation of all acts of terrorism and the obligations incumbent upon them under several resolutions of the General Assembly, States have no need to embark upon the academic enterprise of attempting to define terrorism and to determine its underlying causes. It has been amply demonstrated by experience that such attempts are counterproductive and, moreover, that they have been exhausted, as may be seen from the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on international terrorism. The proper focus for the attention and energy of States is clear from General Assembly decision 48/411 and should lead to a concentration on practical measures for eliminating acts of terrorism.

3. It is in this hopeful frame of mind that the Algerian Government wishes to share with the Sixth Committee its views on practical measures for eliminating acts of terrorism and possible ways to consider this question.

A. Practical measures for eliminating acts of terrorism

4. Positive international law offers a dozen conventions concerning various aspects of the problem of international terrorism in some of its most spectacular forms, namely, the taking of hostages, the unlawful seizure of aircraft, acts of violence at airports and unlawful acts against the safety of maritime navigation. While these conventions are of undeniable importance, they all have the great disadvantage of covering only certain acts of international terrorism, taken individually and in isolation. Factors linked to the urgency of providing the international community with legal instruments for combating the acts of terrorism most highly visible at the time of adoption of those instruments have doubtless favoured this sectoral approach. Nevertheless, in this day and age, when acts of terrorism have taken on a multitude of other characteristics not covered by international law, there is a need for greater codification in this area in order to place it in the global perspective of the fight against all acts of terrorism, whatever their forms, methods and practices.

5. One cannot fail to note, in this respect, that there is a judicial void which the international community must fill as quickly as possible. The Algerian Government feels that the goal must be to achieve an international convention for the prevention and elimination of acts of terrorism, taken as a whole, so that this new international instrument may provide the States with the coercive legal base necessary to the reinforcement of their cooperation in the fight against terrorism. To this end the United Nations already has at its disposal a considerable fund of thought and knowledge concerning the phenomenon of terrorism, as well as a broad range of measures for preventing and eliminating terrorist acts. It is now time for us to make effective use of these significant advantages, which already form a substantial basis for the drafting of an international convention concerning both the definition of terrorism and the obligations incumbent on States or international cooperation, which should be the pillars of this future convention.

6. The problem of defining terrorism might be appropriately resolved within the framework and for the purposes of an international convention on the prevention and elimination of acts of terrorism by concentrating on the material, practical manifestations of terrorism, on which a consensus could be reached, rather than on the conceptual aspects of the phenomenon. The solution should go beyond a simple, hardly exhaustive enumeration of acts of terrorism; a list of acts considered terrorist should be preceded by a general definition, not of the phenomenon of terrorism, but of terrorist acts characterized in terms of their aims and practical implications. The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism, concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations and opened for signature in Geneva on 16 November 1937, provides a pertinent example in this respect and constitutes a good working basis. Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention states that "the expression 'acts of terrorism' means criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons, or a group of persons or the general public". In addition to this general definition, the Convention, in articles 2 and 3, identifies a number of acts as acts of terrorism - and the list is still relevant today - such as wilful acts causing death or bodily harm, the destruction of public property, the supplying of arms, incitement to or assistance in the commission of such acts directed against another State. To these older criminal offences could be added new forms of international organized crime, such as illegal traffic in drugs and arms, which have been found to have links with terrorist activities. Finally, the identification of this nexus of terrorist activities should be followed by the reaffirmation that the parties "unequivocally condemn as criminal and unjustifiable all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize friendly relations among States and their security".

7. Defining the obligations of States under the future convention will undoubtedly be an easier task, because the trail has already been blazed by positive international law and the body of rules created by the United Nations system. The first of these obligations is the principle of "prosecute or extradite" on the basis of individual criminal responsibility, the principle underlying all the international conventions dealing with terrorism in relation to specific sectors. Clearly, a general convention against acts of terrorism cannot deviate from this general principle. Moreover, such a convention cannot fail to codify a general obligation that has been solemnly reiterated for many years in the General Assembly, namely, that States shall "refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other States, or acquiescing in or encouraging activities within their territory directed towards the commission of such acts". This general obligation should also translate, in the future convention, into the adoption of specific measures directed towards effectively implementing the general obligation, such as the harmonization of domestic legislation with the provisions of the future convention; the apprehension, prosecution or extradition of the perpetrators of terrorist acts; and the adoption of precautionary measures to prevent the preparation and organization of terrorist and subversive acts that are to be committed against other States or their nationals.

8. Strengthening international cooperation in combating terrorism should be another key component of the future convention, since action taken at the

national level alone cannot begin to counteract this modern scourge, whose international ramifications have been thoroughly demonstrated. Hence, an international convention in this area must not exclude from its field of application the strengthening of international legal cooperation and mutual assistance. The future convention should provide the appropriate framework for strengthening such cooperation, for example, by fostering exchanges of information on efforts to combat and prevent terrorism and by promoting multilateral, regional and bilateral agreements on legal cooperation and extradition.

9. The Algerian Government, while remaining open to any other constructive proposal, is convinced that the conclusion of an international convention based on the above principles for the prevention and elimination of acts of terrorism is one of the most helpful of the practical steps that could be taken towards eliminating acts of terrorism.

B. Ways to consider the question within the Sixth Committee

10. In the view of Algeria, the most effective way to address the issue would be to set up a working group under the Sixth Committee to be given the task of preparing a draft international convention for the prevention and elimination of acts of terrorism. The group would carry out its work during the session according to a schedule to be determined depending on the other items on the agenda for the session that are allocated to the Sixth Committee. This procedure, which is in keeping with the usual practice of the Committee, could be supplemented, where appropriate, by adopting other measures, such as the establishment of an ad hoc committee to carry on and complete the task of the working group and report on it to the General Assembly at its fiftieth session.

ARGENTINA

[Original: Spanish]

[6 April 1994]

1. Argentina unreservedly condemns acts of terrorism in all forms and manifestations and confirms its full commitment to increased international cooperation with a view to the final elimination of this scourge, which has taken so many innocent lives.

2. The Government of Argentina considers that it will not be worth convening an international conference to define international terrorism until there is prior basic agreement on the part of Governments on such fundamental matters as whether international terrorism should be defined according to its underlying causes or motivation or according to the methods used.

3. The Government of Argentina maintains that a more effective and practical way of forestalling international terrorism would be for the international community to concentrate on promoting increased cooperation among Governments in the following areas: exchanging information on the question; harmonizing

national bodies of legislation; agreeing on measures to bring to trial or extradite those who perpetrate or participate in terrorist acts; and agreeing on measures of a preventive nature.

4. Without prejudice to the above comments, the Government of Argentina considers that international liability is incurred by subjects of international law who instigate, assist in or acquiesce in, whether expressly or tacitly, the organization and/or perpetration of terrorist acts.

5. Lastly, Argentina reaffirms the condemnation of terrorism expressed at the most recent Ibero-American Summit, held at Bahia, Brazil, in 1993.

BELARUS

[Original: Russian]

[6 July 1994]

1. Terrorism is one of the most complex phenomena of modern times and one which adversely affects international relations. Every year, hundreds of people are the victims of terrorist acts. The methods of terrorists who carry out such acts are becoming more and more sophisticated. The growth in the number of terrorist and extremist groups and the increasing diversity of the political programmes and causes they advocate are coupled with the use by the members of such groups of the fruits of scientific and technical progress. Today, the possibility of the use of nuclear materials or chemical and bacteriological weapons by terrorist groups represents a special danger. Terrorism has become not only a destabilizing factor in international relations but one capable of paralysing the political will of Governments. Where instability exists, terrorism becomes an attractive means for attaining political ends.

2. Belarus attaches great importance to the efforts of the United Nations and other international organizations to combat international terrorism.

3. Belarus is a party to a number of international conventions aimed at combating terrorism. It has signed and intends to ratify the 1991 Montreal Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection.

4. In connection with the question of international legal means to combat terrorism, the Government of Belarus considers it highly important to work out definitions of acts of international terrorism in order to make it possible to determine in practice which terrorist acts are clearly intended to disrupt international relations and fall within the purview of international legal law.

5. Defining the scope of acts of international terrorism might provide a basis for the elaboration of appropriate international agreements. It would make it possible where necessary to shift the emphasis (which is particularly important for the mobilization of effective international cooperation) from the individual perpetrators of acts of international terrorism to States, which are the primary subjects of international relations, and to decide the question of defining specific actions as acts of international terrorism on a proper scientific and theoretical basis and thus to establish responsibility for them.

6. At the same time, enacting more stringent national legislation, expanding the list of acts defined as terrorist in international agreements or coordinating the activities of police services will not be sufficient individually to solve the problem. It is necessary to raise international cooperation to a qualitatively new level. From that point of view, a conference of diplomatic representatives under the auspices of the United Nations to prepare an international legal instrument to combat terrorism might be very fruitful.

7. Significant steps have been taken recently to increase cooperation among States with the aim of broadening the political and legal basis for combating terrorism. At the same time, in the opinion of Belarus, the level of international cooperation for the prevention of international terrorism is not commensurate with the scale and magnitude of the problem which such cooperation is supposed to solve. The hijacking and blowing up of aircraft and ships, the seizure of hostages and the kidnapping of individuals are clear evidence of the need to strengthen State cooperation for the eradication of these phenomena. Cooperation between States must be based on the principles and rules of international law and the values common to all humanity. The starting-point for the consolidation of international efforts towards this end must be the protection of the life, freedoms and dignity of every individual and all peoples.

8. The development of international terrorism has thus far outstripped the joint efforts of States to combat it. From that point of view it is necessary to take universal measures and establish international structures that are adequate to the task of expressing the unanimous rejection and repudiation of terrorism and effectively combating it in all its manifestations.

9. Consideration should be given to the possibility of establishing a centre within the United Nations Secretariat to deal with international terrorism, which would, inter alia, collect and analyse data on various aspects of the problem and, at the request of interested Governments, provide advice in situations involving acts of international terrorism. Such a centre within the United Nations Secretariat could, together with other bodies, constitute an international infrastructure for effective cooperation and coordination for the prevention and suppression of acts of international terrorism.

10. Belarus is prepared to assist in promoting efforts to eradicate terrorism on the basis of a broad consensus, which can be achieved by strengthening confidence through specific practical actions.

CUBA

[Original: Spanish]

[22 June 1994]

1. Under the principles and rules governing its domestic and external policy, the Government of the Republic of Cuba punishes the acts, methods and practices of international terrorism in all forms, including those in which States are

responsible for encouraging, supporting or organizing terrorism against other States.

2. In line with the above-mentioned policy, Cuba supports the efforts of the United Nations to deal with the question of international terrorism. Accordingly, it welcomes the idea of creating a working group to discuss practical measures to prevent and punish international terrorism.

3. The Government of Cuba endorses the suggestion concerning the convening of an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations. This would be a positive step in combating this scourge, in view of the absence of a clear, express definition of international terrorism that would make it possible to take measures to prevent or eliminate it, and the need to define clearly how it differs from the activities of national liberation movements and the exercise of the right of peoples to struggle for self-determination.

ECUADOR

[Original: Spanish]

[30 June 1994]

1. Traditionally and in accordance with the principles of its international policy, Ecuador has supported the struggle of peoples subjected to colonial regimes or other forms of foreign domination, but it categorically and unequivocally condemns terrorism in all its forms, irrespective of the motives or political objective involved, since it considers this practice to be a flagrant violation of fundamental human rights and a threat to the security and stability of nations.

2. Terrorism must be universally condemned and combated using all existing means; all States must refrain from organizing, assisting, instigating, facilitating or permitting acts of terrorism in other States. In that context, Ecuador urges the international community to ensure that international conventions on this subject achieve universal participation.

3. Ecuador considers it essential to draw a clear distinction between terrorism and the activities of national liberation movements; only if there is a conceptual definition which has been approved by a majority would it be wise to convene an international conference on the subject. To that end, the work of the International Law Commission should be supported and, if possible, it should be proposed that terrorism be included within the draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind.

4. The link between terrorists and drug traffickers is a phenomenon that arouses particular concern, especially in certain countries of Latin America. Drug trafficking corrupts and weakens basic institutions of the State and of society in general, and goes so far as to restrict the exercise of civil liberties in relation to such matters as trade, the press and free movement. The struggle against this scourge calls for concerted action and a strengthening of cooperation among the countries affected by this problem.

GREECE

(on behalf of the European Union)

[Original: English]

[26 May 1994]

1. The European Union reaffirms its full support for General Assembly resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991, in which the Assembly unequivocally condemned, as criminal and unjustifiable, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism whenever and by whomever committed.

2. The European Union has always regarded terrorist attacks as an outrage. Consequently, the European Union calls upon the international community to strengthen its efforts to root out terrorism by augmenting cooperation among States, using methods within the limits of respect to human rights.

3. In this context, it is essential that States live up to their obligations to refrain from instigating or supporting terrorist acts in other States, or encouraging or acquiescing to activities within their territory directed towards the commission of such acts. Strict compliance with this fundamental principle is central to effective cooperation among States.

4. The European Union believes that, in accordance with applicable law and through agreed international procedures, States should intensify their cooperation by exchanging the information necessary to strengthen the capability of Governments to prevent acts of terrorism and to apprehend and prosecute or extradite persons who have perpetrated or are suspected of having perpetrated such acts. In this context, the United Nations should act as a forum for exchanging views and experiences between its Member States, forming a basis for closer cooperation against international terrorism aimed at the coordination of national policies and procedures, e.g., regarding the prosecution of international terrorists.

5. The European Union also notes that adherence by States to the international conventions relating to various aspects of terrorism is an important step towards combating terrorism. In this context, the European Union suggests that the Secretary-General should, when appropriate, take the initiative in asking all those States Members of the United Nations that have not yet become party to the relevant conventions to consider adhering to them.

6. The European Union is convinced that the best way to combat terrorism is an approach that avoids generalities and focuses on specific acts of terrorism. This approach has been followed with success, within universal organizations, by the conclusion of a number of conventions dealing with such specific acts.

7. In this line of thought, the European Union considers that the holding of a Conference for the purpose of defining terrorism in general would serve no meaningful purpose. By the same token, the European Union sees no merit in creating a working group entrusted with the elaboration of a convention dealing with the question of definition of terrorism or other general matters. What is

a question of urgency and primary importance is that the existing conventions relating to terrorism be applied in good faith by all States parties to them and that appropriate law-enforcement measures be taken.

8. The European Union also urges all States to contribute to the progressive elimination of the causes underlying international terrorism and to pay special attention to all situations, including those involving mass and flagrant violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

INDIA

[Original: English]

[27 June 1994]

1. The item "Measures to eliminate international terrorism" has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1972. This biennial resolution on the subject is usually adopted by consensus, underlining the degree of support for the resolution. In the resolution the Assembly unequivocally condemns, as criminal and unjustifiable, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize the friendly relations among States and their security. It also deeply deplores the loss of human lives which results from such acts of terrorism, as well as pernicious impact of these acts on relations of cooperation among States.

2. Since the introduction of this agenda item in 1972, the menace of international terrorism has spread. It has resulted in killings, kidnappings, destruction of property and disruption of normal civic order in many parts of the world.

3. In resolution 46/51 on "Measures to eliminate international terrorism", the General Assembly urges all States to fulfil their obligations under international law and take effective and resolute measures for speedy and final elimination of international terrorism. India strongly believes that terrorism poses the most dangerous threat to human rights, democracy, development and maintenance of international peace and security. The existing international legal instruments deal with the menace of terrorism in a piecemeal manner on a sectoral basis in specific areas concerning civil aviation, hijacking, maritime navigation, hostage taking, internationally protected persons, etc. What is necessary is to replicate these elements in an umbrella convention, which will be a comprehensive, binding international legal instrument establishing universal jurisdiction over and criminality of terrorist activities and offenders.

4. The need for an international convention to prevent and combat terrorism arises from cross-border support to terrorist activities. Increase in the speed of communications has added to the complexity of the problem. Often acts of terrorism are planned in one country and executed in another. The accomplices or perpetrators of terrorist violence seek refuge in countries other than the State where the act is committed. The consequence of terrorist actions spills across international borders. Often terrorist movements are inspired by

transnational organizations and fundamentalist ideologies. They sometimes have State backing. Preventing or countering such actions therefore goes beyond the purview of municipal law and needs and international convention.

5. Sponsorship of terrorism by States also contravenes the Declaration on Principles on International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. It runs against the spirit of the Charter.

6. Acts of terrorism are a threat to international peace and security. They require United Nations sanctions and other measures.

7. India would propose that a comprehensive international convention against terrorism should also give effect to the principle of "prosecute or extradite". This is already included in the resolution on "Measures to eliminate international terrorism". It must be implemented in practice.

8. In view of the increased importance of the subject, India feels that the agenda item entitled "Measures to eliminate international terrorism" should be considered annually.

9. Consideration of the legal aspects of the question would naturally fall within the mandate of the Sixth Committee in the United Nations. The Sixth Committee may consider during the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly to establish a working group to consider these and other issues. The Working Group may submit its recommendations to the General Assembly at its fiftieth session.

MALTA

[Original: English]

[28 June 1994]

1. The Government of Malta unquestionably condemns all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed. It believes that the nature of international terrorism requires that measures taken by individual States to combat it be enhanced through the increased cooperation of the international community and it reaffirms its commitment to participate fully in the endeavours of the international community to wipe out international terrorism and to participate positively in the deliberation of proposals directed at achieving this end.

2. These views are a reaffirmation of the views of the Government of Malta as expressed in the Permanent Mission of Malta's note to the Secretary-General dated 19 March 1993 (see A/48/267).

MONACO

[Original: French]

[4 March 1994]

1. Monaco is anxious to contribute to international cooperation regarding measures to eliminate international terrorism.

2. To that end, the Principality of Monaco has been a party:

- Since 1984, to the Convention on Offences and certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963;

- Since 1984, to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970;

- Since 1983, to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, concluded at Montreal on 23 September 1971.

3. Finally, Monaco has just acceded to the Montreal Protocol of 24 February 1988 for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention of 1971.

4. This last text entered into force on 10 February 1994, following Sovereign Order No. 11.177, published in the Journal of Monaco on 18 February 1994, making it effective.

NAMIBIA

[Original: English]

[6 June 1994]

1. Namibia takes an unwavering stand against any act of international terrorism and condemns as criminal against humanity and therefore unjustifiable all acts of international terrorism wherever and by whomever they are committed. As a nation which waged a long and bitter war of liberation against the South African colonial regime, Namibia is too well aware of the nature of national liberation struggles. The occupying regime called the liberation movement a terrorist organization, but it was a lonely voice. The United Nations and the entire international community supported in full the war of liberation which was waged inside the territory and against the colonial and occupying regime. In the same manner, the United Nations and the international community supported the struggle to end apartheid and bring about freedom and majority rule in South Africa. The methods used in Namibia and South Africa and elsewhere on the African continent in pursuit of national liberation were not considered terrorist by the United Nations and the international community simply because they were not. The point being made is that the United Nations and the

international community are able to discern true national liberation struggles from sheer international terrorism.

2. In this connection, it is hard to see the justification for holding an international conference solely for the purpose of defining terrorism. Even after defining it, those who are determined to disregard and defy the international community will continue to do so.

3. What is important, therefore, is that States parties to the various conventions against terrorism should abide by the terms of those instruments by lending their support and cooperating in the apprehension and prosecution of suspects or in their extradition in appropriate cases. Those States which have not acceded to those conventions should be encouraged to do so.

4. The world community should speed up the establishment of an international criminal court which could deal with cases of terrorism. This will obviate the problem of countries refusing to give up their nationals to stand trial before the domestic courts of other countries.

5. Countries must be made aware that they have a duty to their own nationals and nationals of other countries to cooperate in the fight against international terrorism because people who carry out terrorist acts in international theatres cannot and do not select their victims. Innocent persons are bound to be hurt in international terrorist acts, i.e., persons who have neither the political means nor the political power to help the perpetrators of the acts to achieve their goals. Indeed, most of these people do not even comprehend the issues at stake and the perceived objectives of the perpetrators of the terrorist acts.

POLAND

[Original: English]

[30 June 1994]

1. The Government of the Republic of Poland shares the views of other States and reaffirms its opinion that combating and preventing terrorism is not only a problem of measures taken by individual States but also a matter of increased international cooperation. Such cooperation should be aimed not only at combating and eradicating international terrorism but as well on the elaboration of measures that would prevent and stop any acts of international terrorism.

2. It is obvious that international terrorism cannot be considered as a phenomenon that will disappear in the near future. On the contrary, contemporary terrorists and their organizations have now more developed and more sophisticated technical methods of operation, modern arms and means of transportation and communication, as well as increased sources of financing for their activities. There is even a probable danger of their obtaining nuclear weapons to achieve their criminal goals.

3. Such a situation requires a concerted counteraction from the side of the endangered international community. It has to be undertaken, first of all, on a

universal level, by both the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies. Elaboration of international legal instruments seems to have a crucial importance for achieving this purpose.

4. There have been two ways followed up to now by the international community. The first one was to elaborate a definition of international terrorism and to prepare a general convention on the prevention of terrorism. However, this method has appeared rather difficult and unproductive. On the other hand, it seems easier to identify specific categories of terrorist acts which the entire international community is ready to condemn and suppress, regardless of the motives of the offenders.

5. Consequently, international cooperation has been focused on concrete and effective measures against terrorism contained in separate international legal instruments. In resolution 44/29 of 4 December 1989 the General Assembly listed those conventions which were elaborated under the auspices of the United Nations and specialized agencies.

6. Poland has undertaken various actions on the multilateral level for the purpose of establishing legal instruments for the prevention and suppression of terrorist acts. We have already ratified the overwhelming majority of multilateral conventions dealing with various forms of terrorism, namely:

- Convention on Offences and certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963 (ratified in 1971);

- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 (ratified in 1972);

- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971 (ratified in 1975);

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted in New York on 14 December 1973 (ratified in 1982);

- Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980 (ratified in 1983);

- Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 (ratified in 1991);

- Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 (ratified in 1991).

The remaining international legal instruments are being submitted through the relevant procedure for their ratification or accession by the Polish authorities.

7. Poland is deeply interested in the preparation of further international instruments under the auspices of the United Nations for the purpose of suppressing terrorism. For instance, we were one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 48/37 of 9 December 1993 on the "Question of responsibility for attacks on United Nations and associated personnel and measures to ensure that those responsible for such attacks are brought to justice". The Polish delegation actively participates in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of an International Convention dealing with the Safety and Security of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

8. As regards the convening of an international conference on terrorism under the auspices of the United Nations, a question which was raised by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991, it has to be carefully considered if such a conference would not impede international progress in elaborating further legal instruments to combat terrorism in its particular forms. Such a fear may derive from possible attempts during the conference to concentrate mainly on a discussion over such politically affected problems as a definition of international terrorism or its differentiation from the struggle of peoples for national liberation.

9. The Government of the Republic of Poland is of the opinion that in the present-day situation the United Nations should, first of all, concentrate on the practical implementation of the above-mentioned General Assembly resolutions, condemning all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable. The principal role of the United Nations in this field should be to undertake further efforts to urge all States to fulfil their obligations under already existing international conventions to combat terrorist acts as well as to refrain from supporting them in any form in other States. To this end the Government of the Republic of Poland considers also as a useful tool for the prevention of international terrorism the completion of the draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind being prepared by the International Law Commission.

10. Poland welcomes with appreciation all constructive endeavours made by such specialized organizations as the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Tourism Organization. All of them have contributed substantially to the elaboration of numerous anti-terrorist conventions as well as to the development of practical measures of protection against terrorist attacks, including even the protection of potential victims. We see the need for further activities on the part of these and other specialized organizations concerning the prevention and elimination of the threat of terrorism in specific fields of their operation.

11. Finally, the Government of Poland would like to stress that the universal acceptance and strict implementation by the international community of the relevant conventions relating to specific aspects of international terrorism seems now to be the best and most effective method for the prevention and suppression of this phenomenon. Simultaneously, however, there should be also an expansion and improvement of international cooperation of States on a regional and bilateral basis, together with appropriate completion of domestic legislations providing regulations relating to the punishment of acts of

terrorism. Poland has already established several working contacts with other States in order to exchange experiences in methods and practices of combating terrorism. We also express our interest in acceding to the existing conventions of the Council of Europe on this matter.

12. Poland was one of the first States to establish separate police units specially trained and prepared for the suppression of terrorism. During the last four years, Poland has concluded a large number of international agreements, mostly with neighbouring countries, concerning direct cooperation of police authorities in combating organized crime, including, most notably, international terrorism.

SAN MARINO

[Original: English]

[18 February 1994]

San Marino does not have any form of terrorism, thus it has not adopted, until now, any measures against it.

SWEDEN

(on behalf of the Nordic countries)

[Original: English]

[21 June 1994]

1. The Nordic countries strongly and unequivocally condemn all acts of terrorism. International cooperation is of the utmost importance in combating international terrorism. Acts of terrorism are already deemed as illegal at the international level. The General Assembly, in its resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991, which was adopted without a vote, condemned, as criminal and unjustifiable, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed.

2. The most fruitful approach, therefore, remains that of enhancing adherence to existing international agreements, aiming at preventing international terrorism in its various forms and applying sanctions ensuring that perpetrators are brought to justice. The Nordic countries consider that an international conference on the subject would not serve the purpose of preventing terrorism. It is not likely that such a project would lead to real progress and serve as an efficient contribution to combating terrorism. On the contrary, a conference might confuse the situation rather than clarifying it, since it could give the impression that existing rules are insufficient for their purposes.

3. Further, also taking into account the need to rationalize the agenda of the General Assembly, it is the view of the Nordic countries that the agenda item

entitled "Measures to eliminate international terrorism" should not have to be considered annually.

TUNISIA

[Original: French]

[30 June 1994]

1. The scale of international terrorism is becoming increasingly disturbing these days. This upsurge is due, inter alia, to obscurantist behaviour that is fundamentally opposed to universally accepted values. In this case the attitudes stem from extremism, fanaticism and intolerance.

2. Faced with this disturbing situation, the international community is urged to look into the matter so as to take the required measures. It is the responsibility of the United Nations to play a decisive role in this context.

3. It is true that, in recent decades, the United Nations has promoted the adoption of international conventions dealing with specific aspects of international terrorism (the taking of hostages, hijacking, etc.), which have had the merit of having a definite deterrent effect. However, despite the commendable progress that has been made, international law still contains a number of loopholes which provide terrorists with room to manoeuvre; these loopholes must be filled as a matter of urgency.

4. Tunisia is conscious of the gravity of this scourge and believes that the United Nations, given its responsibilities as regards security, peace and stability in the world, is in a position to act on the following two fronts.

5. First it must ensure that those States which have not yet done so accede to the international conventions adopted thus far on the issue. Without going back to the question of an international conference to establish a general definition of terrorism - the debate is bound to go on for ever and will inevitably degenerate into futile arguments - and bearing in mind General Assembly resolutions 44/29 and 46/51 which condemn all acts of terrorism and have yet to be implemented, it is highly advisable to adopt a supplementary resolution defining an operational code of conduct to direct international efforts in the struggle against terrorism. This code should build upon the progress already made in international law and must include appropriate rules and mechanisms for containing and combating the upsurge in terrorism. The code must, of course, give particular attention to new manifestations of this phenomenon.

6. The code should:

- Start by emphasizing its unreserved condemnation of all terrorist acts, methods and practices, whatever their form or manifestation, wherever and by whomsoever committed, including crimes stemming from extremist behaviour, even those of a religious nature, in accordance with the spirit of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1994/18;

- Then underscore the strong determination of the international community to deal with the scourge by every means, both at the level of its causes and at the level of its manifestations;

- Lastly, highlight international solidarity, which is the sole guarantee of success in the struggle against terrorism, by pledging to take effective operational measures in the context of active cooperation on the bilateral, regional and international level, to establish the following principles:

(a) Respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States and non-interference in their internal affairs. Member States must in this context undertake to fulfil their obligation under international law to refrain from organizing, inspiring, financing, encouraging or acquiescing in activities of a terrorist nature or having terrorist aims, or participating therein by any means whatsoever, and to take the necessary operational measures so that their respective territories are not used to shelter camps for the training or indoctrination of terrorist elements, or the preparation or organization of terrorist acts directed against other States or nationals thereof;

(b) Strict implementation of international conventions while refraining from any erroneous interpretation of the latter's provisions that might provide terrorists with room to manoeuvre, such as the provisions relating to the right of asylum and political refugees. It would be perfectly appropriate, in this context, for Member States to refrain from assigning any political status whatsoever to persons found guilty of and punished for terrorist actions, thereby preventing terrorism from spreading;

(c) The commitment of Member States to abide by the obligation incumbent on them under international law to prosecute or extradite terrorist elements;

(d) The commitment of all States and organizations concerned to hold prior consultations, specifically with the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), before issuing refugee cards, so as to check applicants' police records and see whether they have been involved in terrorist actions.

7. In order to ensure implementation of the aforesaid provisions, this code of conduct must have a monitoring and follow-up mechanism which will function as follows:

(a) Establishment within the United Nations of an observation point (for example, a standing committee of inquiry within the framework of the Sixth Committee (legal questions)) responsible for:

- Reporting and identifying terrorist actions;

- Gathering explanations from the States involved;

- Reporting them to the appropriate bodies (Sixth Committee, Security Council, etc.);

(b) The Security Council must, in the light of these reports and recommendations, effectively suppress terrorist actions by resorting to the mechanisms provided for the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

TURKEY

[Original: English]

[27 June 1994]

1. The Government of Turkey unequivocally condemns all acts, methods and practices of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, without making any discrimination between the underlying purposes and motivations, and is determined to contribute to the efforts aimed at combating and eliminating terrorism.

2. The Government of Turkey is deeply concerned by the increasing number of innocent persons killed and massacred by terrorists. Turkey considers the activities of terrorist groups as gross violations of human rights and, in this respect, reiterates its position which is the approach taken in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in its relevant parts.

3. In this spirit, the Government of Turkey urges all States to comply with their obligations under the bilateral and multilateral conventions relating to various aspects of terrorism and to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other States, or acquiescing in or encouraging activities within their territory directed towards the commission of such acts. The Government of Turkey calls upon all States to enhance cooperation in the fight against terrorism at the national, regional and international levels, taking into consideration the linkage between terrorism, illicit transfer of arms, drug trafficking and money laundering.

4. Turkey unreservedly condemns as criminal all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed, including those which jeopardize friendly relations between States, and which are a threat to the stability, territorial integrity, security, economic and social development of States.

5. The Government of Turkey believes that convening a conference to define terrorism is controversial. Experience shows that a consensus by the international community on such a conference still lies beyond the realm of possibility. Consequently, the convening of such a conference would serve no other purpose than reviving controversies, which might thus lead to the weakening of the international community's determination and to a slackening in its efforts to combat terrorism.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[Original: English]

[28 June 1994]

1. The United States of America fully supports the very constructive role played by the United Nations and its relevant specialized agencies in facilitating communications and cooperation among nations on the subject of international terrorism in all its forms. These and other efforts in the international community to combat terrorism must continue and be strengthened.

2. As a general matter, the United States believes the United Nations should concentrate on the practical implementation of General Assembly resolutions 44/29 and 46/51, by which the Assembly unequivocally condemned as criminal and unjustifiable all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed; called for an end to hostage taking and for all States to use their political influence to accomplish that objective; called upon all States to fulfil their obligations under international law to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting, participating in, encouraging or acquiescing in terrorist activities or preparations for them; urged all States to fulfil their obligations under existing international anti-terrorism conventions to prosecute or extradite offenders and to cooperate in the apprehension and prosecution of offenders; and appealed to all States that had not yet done so to become party to the existing international anti-terrorism conventions.

3. The United States notes that while nearly every State Member of the United Nations is party to the Aircraft Sabotage Convention, the Aircraft Hijacking Convention and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, less than half of the States Members of the United Nations have become party to the Hostage Taking Convention, less than a third have ratified the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and only a handful of countries have ratified the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Maritime Terrorism Convention and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Airport Security Protocol. The United States is a party to all of these instruments except the recently concluded IMO Convention and ICAO Airport Security Protocol, which the United States intends to ratify after the implementing legislation is enacted. The United States firmly believes that in order for these anti-terrorism conventions to be made more effective, parties thereto should take all appropriate steps to encourage non-parties to accede to them, and parties should use their political influence to encourage other parties to abide by their obligations under these conventions.

4. The United States applauds the ground-breaking role played in recent years by the United Nations Security Council in combating international terrorism in relation to the Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 bombing cases. For the first time, the Security Council acted under Chapter VII to find that the actions of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in regard to these two heinous acts of terrorism constituted a threat to international peace and security, and called on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to make a full and effective response to demands for: the extradition of the suspects in the Pan Am 103 bombing; cooperation in the

Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 bombing investigations; the immediate cessation of support for international terrorism; and the payment of appropriate compensation to the victims of the bombings. Proportionate economic sanctions were imposed on the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya when it failed to comply with the Security Council resolutions. This concrete action in response to acts of international terrorism sends the clearest signal to States implicated in terrorist acts that the international community will not tolerate such behaviour and serves as an important deterrent to States considering support for terrorist acts or groups.

5. The United States also welcomes the work of the Ad Hoc Committee established by the General Assembly in its resolution 48/37 of 9 December 1993 to elaborate an international convention dealing with the safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel. Such a convention will assist in deterring attacks by terrorists against United Nations peace-keepers and associated personnel, and we hope that the Ad Hoc Committee will make every effort to complete the text of the convention in the shortest possible period of time.

6. While the Secretary-General's note of 24 January 1994 did not specifically raise the issue that has been discussed in the past of an international conference to define terrorism, the United Stats wishes to reiterate its opposition to such a conference for the reasons detailed in document A/48/267/Add.1.

ANNEX

State, as at 20 June 1994, of signatures of, and ratifications of, accessions to or successions to, international conventions relating to various aspects of the problem of international terrorism

A. Conventions in respect of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations performs depository functions a/

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973 (entered into force on 20 February 1977, in accordance with article 17 (a))

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession, succession
Antigua and Barbuda		19 July 1993
Argentina		18 March 1992
Armenia		18 May 1994
Australia	30 December 1974	20 June 1977
Austria		3 August 1977
Bahamas		22 July 1986
Barbados		26 October 1979
Belarus	11 June 1974	5 February 1976
Bhutan		16 January 1989
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 September 1993
Bulgaria	27 June 1974	18 July 1974
Burundi		17 December 1980
Cameroon		8 June 1992
Canada	26 June 1974	4 August 1976
Chile		21 January 1977
China		5 August 1987
Costa Rica		2 November 1977
Croatia		12 October 1992
Cyprus		24 December 1975
Czech Republic		22 February 1993
Denmark	10 May 1974	1 July 1975
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		1 December 1982
Dominican Republic		8 July 1977
Ecuador	27 August 1974	12 March 1975

a/ For the text of reservations, declarations or communications accompanying the signatures, ratifications, accessions or declarations of succession to the two conventions below, see Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General, document ST/LEG/SER.E/12 as well as its subsequent issues.

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession, succession
Egypt		25 June 1986
El Salvador		8 August 1980
Estonia		21 October 1991
Finland	10 May 1974	31 October 1978
Gabon		14 October 1981
Germany	15 August 1974	25 January 1977
Ghana		25 April 1975
Greece		3 July 1984
Guatemala	12 December 1974	18 January 1983
Haiti		25 August 1980
Hungary	6 November 1974	26 March 1975
Iceland	10 May 1974	2 August 1977
India		11 April 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		12 July 1978
Iraq		28 February 1978
Israel		31 July 1980
Italy	30 December 1974	30 August 1985
Jamaica		21 September 1978
Japan		8 June 1987
Jordan		18 December 1984
Kuwait		1 March 1989
Latvia		14 April 1992
Liberia		30 September 1975
Malawi		14 March 1977
Maldives		21 August 1990
Mexico		22 April 1980
Mongolia	23 August 1974	8 August 1975
Nepal		9 March 1990
Netherlands		6 December 1988
New Zealand		12 November 1985
Nicaragua	29 October 1974	10 March 1975
Niger		17 June 1985
Norway	10 May 1974	28 April 1980
Oman		22 March 1988
Pakistan		29 March 1976
Panama		17 June 1980
Paraguay	25 October 1974	24 November 1975
Peru		25 April 1978
Philippines		26 November 1976
Poland	7 June 1974	14 December 1982
Republic of Korea		25 May 1983
Romania	27 December 1974	15 August 1978
Russian Federation	7 June 1974	15 January 1976
Rwanda	15 October 1974	29 November 1977
Seychelles		29 May 1980
Slovakia		28 May 1993
Slovenia		6 July 1992
Spain		8 August 1985

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession, succession
Sri Lanka		27 February 1991
Sweden	10 May 1974	1 July 1975
Switzerland		5 March 1985
Syrian Arab Republic		25 April 1988
Togo		30 December 1980
Trinidad and Tobago		15 June 1979
Tunisia	15 May 1974	21 January 1977
Turkey		11 June 1981
Ukraine	18 June 1974	20 January 1976
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	13 December 1974	2 May 1979
United States of America	28 December 1973	26 October 1976
Uruguay		13 June 1978
Yemen		9 February 1987
Yugoslavia	17 December 1974	29 December 1976
Zaire		25 July 1977

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979 (entered into force on 3 June 1983, in accordance with article 18 (i))

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession, succession
Antigua and Barbuda		6 August 1986
Argentina		18 September 1991
Australia		21 May 1990
Austria	3 October 1980	22 August 1986
Bahamas		4 June 1981
Barbados		9 March 1981
Belarus		1 July 1987
Belgium		3 January 1980
Bhutan		31 August 1981
Bolivia	25 March 1980	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 September 1993
Brunei Darussalam		8 October 1988
Bulgaria		10 March 1988
Cameroon		9 March 1988
Canada	18 February 1980	4 December 1985
China		26 January 1993
Chile	3 January 1980	12 November 1981
Côte d'Ivoire		22 August 1989
Cyprus		13 September 1991
Czech Republic		22 February 1993
Denmark		11 August 1987
Dominica		9 September 1986
Dominican Republic	12 August 1980	
Ecuador		2 May 1988
Egypt	18 December 1980	2 October 1981
El Salvador	10 June 1980	12 February 1981
Finland	29 October 1980	14 April 1983
Gabon	29 February 1980	
Germany	18 December 1979	15 December 1980
Ghana		10 November 1987
Greece	18 March 1980	18 June 1987
Grenada		10 December 1990
Guatemala	30 April 1980	11 March 1983
Haiti	21 April 1980	17 May 1989
Honduras	11 June 1980	1 June 1981
Hungary		2 September 1987
Iceland		6 July 1981
Iraq	14 October 1980	
Israel	19 November 1980	
Italy	18 April 1980	20 March 1986
Jamaica	27 February 1980	
Japan	22 December 1980	8 June 1987

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession, succession
Jordan		1º February 1986
Kenya		8 December 1981
Kuwait		6 February 1989
Lesotho	17 April 1980	5 November 1980
Liberia	30 January 1980	
Luxembourg	18 December 1979	29 April 1991
Malawi		17 March 1986
Mali		8 February 1990
Mauritius	18 June 1980	17 October 1980
Mexico		28 April 1987
Mongolia		9 June 1992
Nepal		9 March 1990
Netherlands	18 December 1980	6 December 1988
New Zealand	24 December 1980	12 November 1985
Norway	18 December 1980	2 July 1981
Oman		22 July 1988
Panama	24 January 1980	19 August 1982
Philippines	2 May 1980	14 October 1980
Portugal	16 June 1980	6 July 1984
Republic of Korea		4 May 1983
Romania		17 May 1990
Russian Federation		11 June 1987
Saint Kitts and Nevis		17 January 1991
Saudi Arabia		8 January 1991
Senegal	2 June 1980	10 March 1987
Slovakia		28 May 1993
Slovenia		6 July 1992
Spain		26 March 1984
Sudan		19 June 1990
Suriname	30 July 1980	5 November 1981
Sweden	25 February 1980	15 January 1981
Switzerland	18 July 1980	5 March 1985
Trinidad and Tobago		1 April 1981
Togo	8 July 1980	25 July 1986
Turkey		15 August 1989
Uganda	10 November 1980	
Ukraine		19 June 1987
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	18 December 1979	22 December 1982
United States of America	21 December 1979	7 December 1984
Venezuela		13 December 1988
Yugoslavia	29 December 1980	19 April 1985
Zaire	2 July 1980	

B. Conventions in respect of which the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency or some Member States perform depository functions

1. Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on 14 September 1963 (entered into force on 4 December 1969, in accordance with article 21, paragraph (1)) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Afghanistan		15 April 1977	14 July 1977
Antigua and Barbuda		19 July 1985	17 October 1985
Argentina		23 July 1971	21 October 1971
Australia		22 June 1970	20 September 1970
Austria		7 February 1974	8 May 1974
Bahamas		15 May 1975	10 July 1973 (1)
Bahrain		9 February 1984	9 May 1984 (2)(3)
Bangladesh		25 July 1978	23 October 1978
Barbados	25 June 1969	4 April 1972	3 July 1972
Belarus		3 February 1988	3 May 1988 (2)(4)
Belgium	20 December 1968	6 August 1970	4 November 1970
Bhutan		25 January 1989	25 April 1989
Bolivia		5 July 1979	3 October 1979
Botswana		16 January 1979	16 April 1979
Brazil	28 February 1969	14 January 1970	14 April 1970
Brunei Darussalam		23 May 1986	21 August 1986
Bulgaria		28 September 1989	27 December 1989 (5)
Burkina Faso	14 September 1963	6 June 1969	4 December 1969
Burundi		14 July 1971	12 October 1971
Cameroon		24 March 1988	22 June 1988
Canada	4 November 1964	7 November 1969	5 February 1970
Cape Verde		4 October 1989	2 January 1990
Central African Republic		11 June 1991	9 September 1991
Chad		30 June 1970	28 September 1970
Chile		24 January 1974	24 April 1974
China		14 November 1978	12 February 1979 (2)(6)
Colombia	8 November 1968	6 July 1973	4 October 1973
Comoros		23 May 1991	21 August 1991
Congo	14 September 1963	13 November 1978	11 February 1979
Costa Rica		24 October 1972	22 January 1973
Côte d'Ivoire		3 June 1970	1 September 1970
Croatia		5 October 1993	8 October 1991 (7)
Cyprus		31 May 1972	29 August 1972
Czech Republic		25 March 1993	1 January 1993 (8)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		9 May 1983	7 August 1983 (2)
Denmark	21 November 1966	17 January 1967	4 December 1969
Djibouti		10 June 1992	8 September 1992
Dominican Republic		3 December 1970	3 March 1971
Ecuador	8 July 1969	3 December 1969	3 March 1970
Egypt		12 February 1975	13 May 1975 (2)
El Salvador		13 February 1980	13 May 1980
Equatorial Guinea		27 February 1991	28 May 1991
Estonia		31 December 1993	31 March 1994
Ethiopia		27 March 1979	25 June 1979 (2)

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Fiji		18 January 1972	10 October 1970 (9)
Finland	24 October 1969	2 April 1971	1 July 1971
France	11 July 1969	11 September 1970	10 December 1970
Gabon		14 January 1970	14 April 1970
Gambia		4 January 1979	4 April 1979
Georgia		16 June 1994	14 September 1994
Germany	14 September 1963	16 December 1969	16 March 1970 (10)
Ghana		2 January 1974	2 April 1974
Greece	21 October 1969	31 May 1971	29 August 1971
Grenada		28 August 1978	26 November 1978
Guatemala	14 September 1963	17 November 1970	15 February 1971 (2)
Guinea		18 January 1994	18 April 1994
Guyana		20 December 1972	19 March 1973
Haiti		26 April 1984	25 July 1984
Holy See	14 September 1963		
Honduras		8 April 1987	7 July 1987 (2)
Hungary		3 December 1970	3 March 1971 (11)
Iceland		16 March 1970	14 June 1970
India		22 July 1975	20 October 1975 (2)
Indonesia	14 September 1963	7 September 1976	6 December 1976 (2)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		28 June 1976	29 September 1976
Iraq		15 May 1974	13 August 1974 (12)
Ireland	20 October 1964	14 November 1975	12 February 1976
Israel	1 November 1968	19 September 1969	18 December 1969
Italy	14 September 1963	18 October 1968	4 December 1969
Jamaica		16 September 1983	15 December 1983
Japan	14 September 1963	26 May 1970	24 August 1970
Jordan		3 May 1973	1 August 1973
Kenya		22 June 1970	20 September 1970
Kuwait		27 November 1979	25 February 1980 (13)
Lao People's Democratic Republic		23 October 1972	21 January 1973
Lebanon		11 June 1974	9 September 1974
Lesotho		28 April 1972	27 July 1972
Liberia	14 September 1963		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		21 June 1972	19 September 1972
Luxembourg		21 September 1972	20 December 1972
Madagascar	2 December 1969	2 December 1969	2 March 1970
Malawi		28 December 1972	28 March 1973
Malaysia		5 March 1985	3 June 1985
Maldives		28 September 1987	27 December 1987
Mali		31 May 1971	29 August 1971
Malta		28 June 1991	26 September 1991
Marshall Islands		15 May 1989	13 August 1989
Mauritania		30 June 1977	28 September 1977
Mauritius		5 April 1983	4 July 1983
Mexico	24 December 1968	18 March 1969	4 December 1969
Monaco		2 June 1983	31 August 1983
Mongolia		24 July 1990	22 October 1990
Morocco		21 October 1975	19 January 1976 (14)
Nauru		17 May 1984	15 August 1984
Nepal		15 January 1979	15 April 1979
Netherlands	9 June 1967	14 November 1969	12 February 1970 (15)
New Zealand		12 February 1974	13 May 1974
Nicaragua		24 August 1973	22 November 1973
Niger	14 April 1969	27 June 1969	4 December 1969
Nigeria	29 June 1965	7 April 1970	6 July 1970
Norway	19 April 1966	17 January 1967	4 December 1969
Oman		9 February 1977	10 May 1977 (2)(16)

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession	Effective date
Pakistan	6 August 1965	11 September 1973	10 December 1973
Panama	14 September 1963	16 November 1970	14 February 1971
Papua New Guinea		6 November 1975	16 September 1975 (2)(17)
Paraguay		9 August 1971	7 November 1971
Peru		12 May 1978	10 August 1978 (2)
Philippines	14 September 1963	26 November 1965	4 December 1969
Poland		19 March 1971	17 June 1971 (2)
Portugal	11 March 1964	25 November 1964	4 December 1969
Qatar		6 August 1981	5 December 1981
Republic of Korea	8 December 1965	19 February 1971	20 May 1971
Romania		15 February 1974	16 May 1974 (2)
Russian Federation		3 February 1988	3 May 1988 (2)(18)
Rwanda		17 May 1971	15 August 1971
Saint Lucia		31 October 1983	29 January 1984
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		18 November 1991	16 February 1992
Saudi Arabia	6 April 1967	21 November 1969	19 February 1970
Senegal	20 February 1964	9 March 1972	7 June 1972
Seychelles		4 January 1979	4 April 1979
Sierra Leone		9 November 1970	7 February 1971
Singapore		1 March 1971	30 May 1971
Slovenia		18 December 1992	25 June 1991 (19)
Solomon Islands		23 March 1982	7 July 1978 (20)
South Africa		26 May 1972	24 August 1972 (2)
Spain	27 July 1964	1 October 1969	30 December 1969
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978	28 August 1978
Suriname		10 September 1979	25 November 1975 (21)
Sweden	14 September 1963	17 January 1967	4 December 1969
Switzerland	31 October 1969	21 December 1970	21 March 1971
Syrian Arab Republic		31 July 1980	29 October 1980 (2)
Thailand		6 March 1972	4 June 1972
Togo		26 July 1971	24 October 1971
Trinidad and Tobago		9 February 1972	9 May 1972
Tunisia		25 February 1975	26 May 1975 (2)
Turkey		17 December 1975	16 March 1976
Uganda		25 June 1982	23 September 1982
Ukraine		29 February 1988	29 May 1988 (2)(22)
United Arab Emirates		16 April 1981	15 July 1981 (23)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 September 1963	29 November 1968	4 December 1969 (24)
United Republic of Tanzania		12 August 1983	10 November 1983
United States of America	14 September 1963	5 September 1969	4 December 1969
Uruguay		26 January 1977	26 April 1977
Vanuatu		31 January 1989	1 May 1989
Venezuela	13 March 1964	4 February 1983	5 May 1983 (2)
Viet Nam		10 October 1979	8 January 1980 (2)
Yemen		26 September 1986	25 December 1986
Yugoslavia*	14 September 1963	12 February 1971	13 May 1971
Zaire		20 July 1977	18 October 1977
Zambia		14 September 1971	13 December 1971
Zimbabwe		8 March 1989	6 June 1989

* "Yugoslavia" refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(1) Declaration dated 15 May 1975 by Bahamas that it considers itself to be found to the said Convention by virtue of the ratification of the United Kingdom and pursuant to customary international law. The Commonwealth of the Bahamas attained independence on 10 July 1973.

(2) Reservation: Does not consider itself bound by article 24, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

(3) Reservation: "The accession of the State of Bahrain to the Convention shall not be considered or interpreted as recognition of 'Israel' either generally or implicitly under the Convention."

(4) Declaration dated 17 December 1987 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (now the Republic of Belarus) that "the accession of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under agreements in force on the suppression of acts of unlawful interference with civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(5) Declaration dated 21 August 1989 by the People's Republic of Bulgaria (now the Republic of Bulgaria) that "the accession of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under the multilateral and bilateral agreements on acts of unlawful interference against civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(6) The instrument of accession contains the following statement: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification by the Chiang clique usurping the name of China in regard to the above-mentioned Convention".

(7) An instrument of succession by the Government of the Republic of Croatia was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization on 5 October 1993, with effect from 8 October 1991.

(8) By a Note dated 8 March 1993, received on 25 March 1993, the Government of the Czech Republic informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that, as a successor State created as a result of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, it considered itself bound by the Convention with effect from 1 January 1993.

(9) Declaration dated 18 January 1972 by Fiji that it succeeded, upon independence (whereof the date was 10 October 1970), to the rights and obligations of the United Kingdom in respect of this Convention.

(10) The German Democratic Republic, which acceded to the Convention on 10 January 1989, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(11) On 12 December 1989, a declaration dated 16 October 1989 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of accession on 3 December 1970 with regard to article 24, paragraph 1, of the Convention. The declaration took effect on 12 December 1989.

(12) Accession by the Republic of Iraq to the Convention shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with it.

(13) It is understood that the accession to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, done at Tokyo, 1963, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(14) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(15) Declaration: "... the Convention, with respect to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, shall not enter into force for Suriname and/or the Netherlands Antilles until the ninetieth day after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands will have notified the International Civil Aviation Organization that in Suriname and/or in the Netherlands Antilles the necessary steps for giving effect to the provisions of the above-mentioned Convention have been taken".

Note 1: On 4 June 1974, a declaration dated 10 May 1974 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that the necessary steps for giving effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in regard to making the Convention applicable to Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles. Accordingly, the Convention takes effect for Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles on 2 September 1974. (See also footnote 20.)

Note 2: By a note dated 30 December 1985 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention is applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(16) The accession by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman to the Convention does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as, recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(17) Declaration dated 6 November 1975 by Papua New Guinea that "it desires to be treated as a party in its own right to the said Convention", which entered into force for Australia on 20 September 1970, and had applied to the Territory of Papua and Trust Territory of New Guinea. Papua New Guinea attained independence on 16 September 1975.

(18) Declaration dated 4 December 1987 by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (now the Russian Federation) that "the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under bilateral and multilateral agreements in force on the suppression of acts of unlawful interference with civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(19) An instrument of succession by the Government of the Republic of Slovenia was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization on 18 December 1992, with effect from 25 June 1991.

(20) The Solomon Islands attained independence on 7 July 1978; the instrument of succession was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization on 23 March 1982.

(21) The instrument of succession was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization on 10 September 1979. Prior to that date the provisions of the Convention applied to Suriname by virtue of a declaration dated 10 May 1974 by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975. (See also footnote 14.)

(22) Declaration dated 13 January 1988 by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (now Ukraine) that "the accession of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft does not affect its rights and obligations under bilateral and multilateral agreements in force on the suppression of acts of unlawful interference with civil aviation, to which it is a Party".

(23) Reservation: "In accepting the said Convention, the Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige it to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said country".

(24) Declaration: "... the provisions of the Convention shall not apply in regard to Southern Rhodesia unless and until the Government of the United Kingdom informs the International Civil Aviation Organization that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented".

Note: On 1 December 1982, a declaration dated 12 November 1982 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization stating that the provisions of the Convention shall extend to Anguilla. Accordingly, the Convention takes effect for Anguilla on 1 December 1982.

2. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970 (entered into force on 14 October 1971) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Afghanistan	16 December 1970	29 August 1979
Antigua and Barbuda		22 July 1985
Argentina	16 December 1970	11 September 1972 (1)
Australia	15 June 1971	9 November 1972
Austria	28 April 1971	11 February 1974
Bahamas		13 August 1976
Bahrain		20 February 1984 (2)
Bangladesh		28 June 1978
Barbados	16 December 1970	2 April 1973
Belarus	16 December 1970	30 December 1971 (2)
Belgium	16 December 1970	24 August 1973
Benin	5 May 1971	13 March 1972
Bhutan		28 December 1988
Bolivia		18 July 1979
Botswana		28 December 1978
Brazil	16 December 1970	14 January 1972 (2)
Brunei Darussalam		16 April 1986
Bulgaria	16 December 1970	19 May 1971 (2)
Burkina Faso		19 October 1987
Burundi	17 February 1971	
Cambodia	16 December 1970	
Cameroon		14 April 1988
Canada	16 December 1970	20 June 1972
Cape Verde		20 October 1977
Central African Republic		1 July 1991
Chad	27 September 1971	12 July 1972
Chile	4 June 1971	2 February 1972
China		10 September 1980 (2)(3)
Colombia	16 December 1970	3 July 1973
Comoros		1 August 1991
Costa Rica	16 December 1970	9 July 1971
Côte d'Ivoire		9 January 1973
Cyprus		5 July 1972
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		28 April 1983
Denmark	16 December 1970	17 October 1972 (4)

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Djibouti		24 November 1992
Dominican Republic	29 June 1971	22 June 1978
Ecuador	19 March 1971	14 June 1971
Egypt		28 February 1975 (2)
El Salvador	16 December 1970	16 January 1973
Equatorial Guinea	4 June 1971	2 January 1991
Estonia		22 December 1993
Ethiopia	16 December 1970	26 March 1979
Fiji	5 October 1971	27 July 1972
Finland	8 January 1971	15 December 1971
France	16 December 1970	18 September 1972
Gabon	16 December 1970	14 July 1971
Gambia	18 May 1971	28 November 1978
Georgia		20 April 1994
Germany	16 December 1970	11 October 1974 (5)
Ghana	16 December 1970	12 December 1973
Greece	16 December 1970	20 September 1973
Grenada		10 August 1978
Guatemala	16 December 1970	16 May 1979 (2)
Guinea		2 May 1984
Guinea-Bissau		20 August 1976
Guyana		21 December 1972
Haiti		9 May 1984
Honduras		13 April 1987
Hungary	16 December 1970	13 August 1971 (6)
Iceland		29 June 1973
India	14 July 1971	12 November 1982 (2)
Indonesia	16 December 1970	27 August 1976 (2)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 December 1970	25 January 1972
Iraq	22 February 1971	3 December 1971
Ireland		24 November 1975
Israel	16 December 1970	16 August 1971
Italy	16 December 1970	19 February 1974
Jamaica	16 December 1970	15 September 1983
Japan	16 December 1970	19 April 1971
Jordan	9 June 1971	18 November 1971
Kenya		11 January 1977
Kuwait	21 July 1971	25 May 1979 (7)
Lao People's Democratic Republic	16 February 1971	6 April 1989
Lebanon		10 August 1973
Lesotho		27 July 1978
Liberia		1 February 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		4 October 1978 (8)
Liechtenstein	24 August 1971	
Luxembourg	16 December 1970	22 November 1978
Madagascar		18 November 1986

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Malawi		21 December 1972 (2)
Malaysia	16 December 1970	4 May 1985
Maldives		1 September 1987
Mali		29 September 1971
Malta		14 June 1991
Marshall Islands		31 May 1989
Mauritania		1 November 1978
Mauritius		25 April 1983
Mexico	16 December 1970	19 July 1972
Monaco		3 June 1983
Mongolia	18 January 1971	8 October 1971
Morocco		24 October 1975 (9)
Nauru		17 May 1984
Nepal		11 January 1979
Netherlands	16 December 1970	27 August 1973 (10)
New Zealand	15 September 1971	12 February 1974
Nicaragua		6 November 1973
Niger	19 February 1971	15 October 1971
Nigeria		3 July 1973
Norway	9 March 1971	23 August 1971
Oman		2 February 1977 (2)(11)
Pakistan	12 August 1971	28 November 1973
Panama	16 December 1970	10 March 1972
Papua New Guinea		15 December 1975 (2)
Paraguay	30 July 1971	4 February 1972
Peru		28 April 1978 (2)
Philippines	16 December 1970	26 March 1973
Poland	16 December 1970	21 March 1972 (2)
Portugal	16 December 1970	27 November 1972
Qatar		26 August 1981 (2)
Republic of Korea		18 January 1973 (12)
Romania	13 October 1971	10 July 1972 (2)
Russian Federation	16 December 1970	24 September 1971 (2)
Rwanda	16 December 1970	3 November 1987
Saint Lucia		8 November 1983
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 November 1991
Saudi Arabia		14 June 1974 (2)(13)
Senegal	10 May 1971	3 February 1978
Seychelles		29 December 1978
Sierra Leone	19 July 1971	13 November 1974
Singapore	8 September 1971	12 April 1978
Slovenia		27 May 1992 (14)
South Africa	16 December 1970	30 May 1972 (2)
Spain	16 March 1971	30 October 1972
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978
Sudan		18 January 1979

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Suriname		27 October 1978 (15)
Sweden	16 December 1970	7 July 1971
Switzerland	16 December 1970	14 September 1971
Syrian Arab Republic		10 July 1980 (2)
Thailand	16 December 1970	16 May 1978
Togo		9 February 1979
Tonga		21 February 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	16 December 1970	31 January 1972
Tunisia		16 November 1981 (2)
Turkey	16 December 1970	17 April 1973
Uganda		27 March 1972
Ukraine	16 December 1970	21 February 1972 (2)
United Arab Emirates		10 April 1981 (16)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	16 December 1970	22 December 1971 (17)
United Republic of Tanzania		9 August 1983
United States of America	16 December 1970	14 September 1971
Uruguay		12 January 1977
Vanuatu		22 February 1989
Venezuela	16 December 1970	7 July 1983
Viet Nam		17 September 1979 (2)
Yemen		29 September 1986
Yugoslavia*	16 December 1970	2 October 1972
Zaire		6 July 1977
Zambia		3 March 1987
Zimbabwe		6 February 1989

---

* Yugoslavia refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(1) The instrument of ratification by Argentina contains a declaration which, in translation, reads: "The application of this Convention to territories the sovereignty of which may be disputed among two or more States, whether Parties to the Convention or not, may not be interpreted as alteration, renunciation or waiver of the position upheld by each up to the present time".

(2) Reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention.

(3) The instrument of accession by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains the following declaration: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China".

(4) Until later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

Note: A notification was received by the Government of the United Kingdom from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark that, with effect from 1 June 1980, Denmark withdraws its reservation, made in the following terms upon ratification, in respect of Greenland:

"Sous la réserve que jusqu'à décision ultérieure la Convention ne s'appliquera pas aux Iles Féroé et au Groënland" (on the understanding that, until later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland (unofficial translation)).

(5) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Convention on 3 June 1971, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(6) On 10 January 1990, instruments were deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification on 13 August 1971 with regard to paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 10 January 1990.

(7) Ratification by Kuwait was accompanied by an Understanding stating that ratification of the Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(8) The instrument of accession deposited by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya contains a disclaimer regarding recognition of Israel.

(9) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(10) The Convention cannot enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until thirty days after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands shall have notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures to give effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles.

Note 1: On 11 June 1974, a declaration was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the

Netherlands Antilles and, consequently, the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this declaration.

Note 2: By a Note dated 9 January 1986 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the Government of the United States that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention is applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(11) Accession to the said Convention by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(12) The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not, in any way, mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government.

(13) Approval by Saudi Arabia does not mean and could not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(14) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovenia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 27 May 1992.

(15) Notification of succession to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 27 October 1978, by virtue of the extension of the Convention to Suriname by the Kingdom of the Netherlands prior to independence. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975.

(16) "In accepting the said Convention, the Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said Country."

(17) The Convention is ratified "in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate".

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971 (entered into force on 26 January 1973) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Afghanistan		26 September 1984 (1)
Antigua and Barbuda		22 July 1985
Argentina	23 September 1971	26 November 1973
Australia	12 October 1972	12 July 1973
Austria	13 November 1972	11 February 1974
Bahamas		27 December 1984
Bahrain		20 February 1984 (1)
Bangladesh		28 June 1978
Barbados	23 September 1971	6 August 1976
Belarus	23 September 1971	31 January 1973 (1)
Belgium	23 September 1971	13 August 1976
Bhutan		28 December 1988
Bolivia		18 July 1979
Botswana	12 October 1972	28 December 1978
Brazil	23 September 1971	24 July 1972 (1)
Brunei Darussalam		16 April 1986
Bulgaria	23 September 1971	28 March 1973 (1)
Burkina Faso		19 October 1987
Burundi	6 March 1972	
Cameroon		11 July 1973 (2)
Canada	23 September 1971	19 June 1972
Cape Verde		20 October 1977
Central African Republic		1 July 1991
Chad	23 September 1971	12 July 1972
Chile		28 February 1974
China		10 September 1980 (1)(3)
Colombia		4 December 1974
Comoros		1 August 1991
Congo	23 September 1971	19 March 1987
Costa Rica	23 September 1971	21 September 1973
Côte d'Ivoire		9 January 1973
Cyprus	28 November 1972	27 July 1973
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		13 August 1980
Denmark	17 October 1972	17 January 1973 (4)

---

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Djibouti		24 November 1992
Dominican Republic	31 May 1972	28 November 1973
Ecuador		12 January 1977
Egypt	24 November 1972	20 May 1975 (1)
El Salvador		25 September 1979
Equatorial Guinea		2 January 1991
Estonia		22 December 1993
Ethiopia	23 September 1971	26 March 1979 (1)
Fiji	21 August 1972	5 March 1973
Finland		13 July 1973
France		30 June 1976 (1)
Gabon	24 November 1971	29 June 1976
Gambia		28 November 1978
Georgia		20 April 1994
Germany	23 September 1971	3 February 1978 (5)
Ghana		12 December 1973
Greece	9 February 1972	15 January 1974
Grenada		10 August 1978
Guatemala	9 May 1972	19 October 1978 (1)
Guinea		2 May 1984
Guinea-Bissau		20 August 1976
Guyana		21 December 1972
Haiti	6 January 1972	9 May 1984
Honduras		13 April 1987
Hungary	23 September 1971	27 December 1972 (6)
Iceland		29 June 1973
India	11 December 1972	12 November 1982
Indonesia		27 August 1976 (1)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		10 July 1973
Iraq		10 September 1974
Ireland		12 October 1976
Israel	23 September 1971	30 June 1972
Italy	23 September 1971	19 February 1974
Jamaica	23 September 1971	15 September 1983
Japan		12 June 1974
Jordan	2 May 1972	13 February 1973
Kenya		11 January 1977
Kuwait		23 November 1979 (7)
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1 November 1972	6 April 1989
Lebanon		23 December 1977
Lesotho		27 July 1978
Liberia		1 February 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		19 February 1974
Luxembourg	29 November 1971	18 May 1982
Madagascar		18 November 1986

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Malawi		21 December 1972 (1)
Malaysia		4 May 1985
Maldives		1 September 1987
Mali		24 August 1972
Malta		14 June 1991
Marshall Islands		31 May 1989
Mauritania		1 November 1978
Mauritius		25 April 1983
Mexico	25 January 1973	12 September 1974
Monaco		3 June 1983
Mongolia	18 February 1972	14 September 1972 (1)
Morocco		24 October 1975 (8)
Nauru		17 May 1984
Nepal		11 January 1979
Netherlands	23 September 1971	27 August 1973 (9)
New Zealand	26 September 1972	12 February 1974
Nicaragua	22 December 1972	6 November 1973
Niger	6 March 1972	1 September 1972
Nigeria		3 July 1973
Norway		1 August 1973
Oman		2 February 1977 (1)(10)
Pakistan		24 January 1974
Panama	18 January 1972	24 April 1972
Papua New Guinea		15 December 1975 (1)
Paraguay	23 January 1973	5 March 1974
Peru		28 April 1978 (1)
Philippines	23 September 1971	26 March 1973
Poland	23 September 1971	28 January 1975 (1)
Portugal	23 September 1971	15 January 1973
Qatar		26 August 1981 (1)
Republic of Korea		2 August 1973 (11)
Romania	10 July 1972	15 August 1975 (1)
Russian Federation	23 September 1971	19 February 1973 (1)
Rwanda	26 June 1972	3 November 1987
Saint Lucia		8 November 1983
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 November 1991
Saudi Arabia		14 June 1974 (1)(12)
Senegal	23 September 1971	3 February 1978
Seychelles		29 December 1978
Sierra Leone		20 September 1979
Singapore	21 November 1972	12 April 1978
Slovenia		27 May 1992 (13)
Solomon Islands		13 April 1982 (14)
South Africa	23 September 1971	30 May 1972 (1)
Spain	15 February 1972	30 October 1972
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification or accession
Sudan		18 January 1979
Suriname		27 October 1978 (15)
Sweden		10 July 1973
Switzerland	23 September 1971	17 January 1978
Syrian Arab Republic		10 July 1980 (1)
Thailand		16 May 1978
Togo		9 February 1979
Tonga		21 February 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	9 February 1972	9 February 1972
Tunisia		16 November 1981 (1)
Turkey	5 July 1972	23 December 1975
Uganda		19 July 1982
Ukraine	23 September 1971	26 January 1973 (1)
United Arab Emirates		10 April 1981 (16)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	23 September 1971	25 October 1973 (17)
United Republic of Tanzania		9 August 1983
United States of America	23 September 1971	1 November 1972
Uruguay		12 January 1977
Uzbekistan		7 February 1994
Vanuatu		6 November 1989
Venezuela	23 September 1971	21 November 1983 (18)
Viet Nam		17 September 1979
Yemen	23 October 1972	29 September 1986
Yugoslavia*	23 September 1971	2 October 1972
Zaire		6 July 1977
Zambia		3 March 1987
Zimbabwe		6 February 1989

---

* Yugoslavia refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(1) Reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention.

(2) "In accordance with the provisions of the Convention of 23 September 1971, for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts directed against the Security of Civil Aviation, the Government of the United Republic of Cameroon declares that in view of the fact that it does not have any relations with South Africa and Portugal, it has no obligation toward these two countries with regard to the implementation of the stipulations of the Convention."

(3) The instrument of accession by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains the following declaration: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China".

(4) Until later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

Note: A notification was received by the Government of the United Kingdom from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark that, with effect from 1 June 1980, Denmark withdraws its reservation, made in the following terms upon ratification, in respect of Greenland:

"Sous la réserve que jusqu'à décision ultérieure la Convention ne s'appliquera pas aux Iles Féroé et au Groënland" (on the understanding that until later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland (unofficial translation)).

(5) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Convention on 9 June 1972, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(6) On 10 January 1990, instruments were deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification on 27 December 1972 with regard to paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 10 January 1990.

(7) It is understood that accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal, 1971, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(8) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(9) The Convention cannot enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until 30 days after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands shall have notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures to give effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles.

Note 1: On 11 June 1974, a declaration was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles and, consequently, the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this declaration.

Note 2: By a Note dated 9 January 1986 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the Government of the United States that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention is applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(10) Accession to the said Convention by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(11) The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not in any way mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government.

(12) Approval by Saudi Arabia does not mean and could not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(13) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovenia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 27 May 1992.

(14) The Solomon Islands attained independence on 7 July 1978; the instrument of succession was deposited on 13 April 1982.

(15) Notification of succession to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 27 October 1978, by virtue of the extension of the Convention to Suriname by the Kingdom of the Netherlands prior to independence. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975.

(16) "In accepting the said Convention, the Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said Country."

(17) The Convention is ratified "in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate".

Note: By a Note dated 20 November 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom declared that Anguilla has been included under the ratification of the Convention by that Government with effect from 7 November 1990.

(18) The instrument of ratification by the Government of Venezuela contains the following reservation regarding articles 4, 7 and 8 of the Convention:

"Venezuela will take into consideration clearly political motives and the circumstances under which offences described in Article 1 of this Convention are committed, in refusing to extradite or prosecute an offender, unless financial extortion or injury to the crew, passengers, or other persons has occurred".

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made the following declaration in a Note dated 6 August 1985 to the Department of State of the Government of the United States:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela in so far as it purports to limit the obligation under Article 7 of the Convention to submit the case against an offender to the competent authorities of the State for the purpose of prosecution".

With reference to the above declaration by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Government of Venezuela, in a Note dated 21 November 1985, informed the Department of State of the Government of the United States of the following:

"The reserve made by the Government of Venezuela to Articles 4, 7 and 8 of the Convention is based on the fact that the principle of asylum is contemplated in Article 116 of the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela. Article 116 reads:

> 'The Republic grants asylum to any person subject to persecution or which finds itself in danger, for political reasons, within the conditions and requirements established by the laws and norms of international law.'

It is for this reason that the Government of Venezuela considers that in order to protect this right, which would be diminished by the application without limits of the said articles, it was necessary to request the formulation of the declaration contemplated in Article 2 of the Law approving the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Security (sic) of Civil Aviation".

The Government of Italy made the following declaration in a Note dated 21 November 1985 to the Department of State of the Government of the United States:

"The Government of Italy does not consider as valid the reservation formulated by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela due to the fact that it may be considered as aiming to limit the obligation under Article 7 of the Convention to submit the case against an offender to the competent authorities of the State for the purpose of prosecution".

4. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980 (entered into force on 8 February 1987, in accordance with article 19, paragraph 1) a/

States/ organization	Date of signature	Date of deposit of expression of consent to be bound	Entry into force
Antigua and Barbuda		4 August 1993	3 September 1993
Argentina	28 February 1986	6 April 1989	6 May 1989 (1)
Armenia		24 August 1993	23 September 1993
Australia	22 February 1984	22 September 1987	22 October 1987
Austria	3 March 1980	22 December 1988	21 January 1989
Belarus		9 September 1993	effect from 14 June 1993 (2)
Belgium b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Brazil	15 May 1981	17 October 1985	8 February 1987
Bulgaria	23 June 1981	10 April 1984	8 February 1987 (3)
Canada	23 September 1980	21 March 1986	8 February 1987
China		10 January 1989	9 February 1989 (4)
Croatia		29 September 1992	effect from 8 October 1991
Czech Republic		24 March 1993	effect from 1 January 1993
Denmark b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Dominican Republic	3 March 1980		
Ecuador	26 June 1986		
Estonia		9 May 1994	8 June 1994
EURATOM	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991 (5)
Finland	25 June 1981	22 September 1989	22 October 1989
France b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991 (6)
Germany b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Greece b/	3 March 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Guatemala	12 March 1980	23 April 1985	8 February 1987 (7)
Haiti	9 April 1980		
Hungary	17 June 1980	4 May 1984	8 February 1987 (8)(21)
Indonesia	3 July 1986	5 November 1986	8 February 1987 (9)
Ireland b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Israel	17 June 1983 (10)		
Italy b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991 (11)
Japan		28 October 1988	27 November 1988
Liechtenstein	13 January 1986	25 November 1986	8 February 1987
Lithuania		7 December 1993	6 January 1994
Luxembourg b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Mexico		4 April 1988	4 May 1988
Mongolia	23 January 1986	28 May 1986	8 February 1987 (12)(21)
Morocco	25 July 1980		
Netherlands b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991 (13)
Niger	7 January 1985		
Norway	26 January 1983	15 August 1985	8 February 1987
Panama	18 March 1980		
Paraguay	21 May 1980	6 February 1985	8 February 1987
Philippines	19 May 1980	22 September 1981	8 February 1987
Poland	6 August 1980	5 October 1983	8 February 1987 (14)
Portugal b/	19 September 1984	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
Republic of Korea	29 December 1981	7 April 1982	8 February 1987 (15)
Romania	15 January 1981 (16)	23 November 1993	23 December 1993

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

b/ Signed/ratified as EURATOM member State.

States/ organization	Date of signature	Date of deposit of expression of consent to be bound	Entry into force
Russian Federation	22 May 1980	25 May 1983 continued 26 December 1991	8 February 1987 (17)
Slovakia		10 February 1993	effect from 1 January 1993
Slovenia		7 July 1992	effect from 25 June 1991
South Africa	18 May 1981 (18)		
Spain b/	7 April 1986	6 September 1991	6 October 1991 (19)
Sweden	2 July 1980	1 August 1980	8 February 1987
Switzerland	9 January 1987	9 January 1987	8 February 1987
Tunisia		8 April 1993	8 May 1993
Turkey	23 August 1983	27 February 1985	8 February 1987 (20)
Ukraine		6 July 1993	5 August 1993
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland b/	13 June 1980	6 September 1991	6 October 1991
United States of America	3 March 1980	13 December 1982	8 February 1987
Yugoslavia	15 July 1980	14 May 1986 continued 28 April 1992	8 February 1987

(1) The following reservation was attached to the instrument of ratification of the Convention:

"In accordance with the provisions of Article 17.3 of the Convention, Argentina does not consider itself bound by either of the dispute settlement procedures provided for in Article 17.2 of the Convention".

(2) In succeeding, Belarus upheld the reservation made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics upon its adherence (see note 17).

(3) "The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by Article 17 (2) of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, according to which any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of any Party to such dispute, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice."

(4) The following reservation was attached to the instrument of accession: "China will not be bound by the two dispute settlement procedures as stipulated in paragraph 2, Article 17 of the said Convention".

(5) "[The European Atomic Energy Community] would like to declare:

"(a) that the Member States of the Community are at present Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

"(b) that Articles 7 to 13 of the Convention are not applicable to the Community.

"Further, pursuant to Article 17 (3) of the Convention, [the European Atomic Energy Community] declare[s] that, since only States may be parties in cases before the International Court of Justice, the Community considers itself exclusively bound by the arbitration procedures provided for in Article 17 (2)."

(6) Upon signature:

"Recalling its statement contained in document CPNM/90 of 25 October 1979, the French Government declares that the jurisdiction referred to in Article 8, paragraph 4 may not be invoked against it, since the criterion of jurisdiction based on involvement in international nuclear transport as the exporting or importing State is not expressly recognized in international law and is not provided for in French national legislation."

"In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3, France declares that it does not accept the competence of the International Court of Justice in the settlement of the disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of this article, nor that of the President of the International Court of Justice to appoint one or more arbitrators."

Note: The French statement regarding article 6 bis (document CPNM/87) reads: "... This provision introduces new elements to the field of criminal jurisdiction, necessitating a thorough examination of their legal implications ..." (document CPNM/90)

Upon approval:

"(1) In approving the Convention, the French Government expresses the following reservation: the offences described in subparagraphs 1 (e) and 1 (f) of article 7 of the Convention shall be punished in accordance with the provisions of French penal legislation.

"(2) The French Government declares that the jurisdiction referred to in article 8, paragraph 4 may not be invoked against it, since the criterion of jurisdiction based on involvement in international nuclear transport as the exporting or importing State is not expressly recognized in international law and is not provided for in French national legislation.

"(3) In accordance with article 17, paragraph 3, France declares that it does not accept the competence of the International Court of Justice in the settlement of the disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of this article, nor that of the President of the International Court of Justice to appoint one or more arbitrators."

(7) The instrument of ratification contains the following reservation:

"The Republic of Guatemala does not consider itself bound by any of the dispute settlement procedures set out in paragraph 2 of Article 17 of the Convention, which provide for the submission of disputes to arbitration or their referral to the International Court of Justice for decision".

(8) "The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of paragraph 2 of article 17 that any dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of article 17 shall, at the request of any party to such dispute, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

(9) The instrument of ratification contains the following reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 17, paragraph 2 of this Convention and takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all parties to the dispute".

(10) "In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3, Israel declares that it does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(11) "(1) In connection with article 4.2

Italy considers that if assurances as to the levels of physical protection described in annex I have not been received in good time the importing State party may take appropriate bilateral steps as far as practicable to assure itself that the transport will take place in compliance with the aforesaid levels.

"(2) In connection with article 10

The last words 'through proceedings in accordance with the laws of the State' are to be considered as referring to the whole article 10.

"Italy considers that international cooperation and assistance for physical protection and recovery of nuclear materials as well as criminal rules and extradition will apply also to the domestic use, storage and transport of nuclear material used for peaceful purposes. Italy also considers that no provision contained in this convention shall be interpreted as precluding the possibility to widen the scope of the convention at the review conference foreseen in article 16."

(12) "... does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2, article 17 of the Convention, whereby disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention could be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice for decision at the request of any party to the dispute."

(13) "With regard to the obligation to exercise jurisdiction referred to in Article 10 of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, done at Vienna/New York on 3 March 1980, the Kingdom of the Netherlands makes the reservation, that in cases where the judicial authorities of the Netherlands are unable to exercise jurisdiction on the grounds of one of the principles referred to in Article 8, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Kingdom shall be bound by this obligation only if it has received an extradition request from a Party to the Convention and the said request has been rejected."

(14) "After having seen and examined the said Convention and the annexes thereto, the Council of State approved them subject to the reservation that the People's Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 17.2 of the Convention; ..."

(15) "The Government of the Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(16) "The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 2 of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which state that any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which cannot be settled by negotiation or by any other peaceful means of settling disputes shall, at the request of any party to such dispute, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice for decision.

"The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes can be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

"In signing the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that, in its interpretation, the provisions of Article 18, paragraph 4 refer exclusively to organizations to which the Member States have transferred competence to negotiate, conclude and apply international agreements on their behalf and to exercise the rights and fulfil the responsibilities entailed by such agreements including the right to vote."

(17) "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 2 of the Convention that any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any party to such dispute."

(18) "In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3, the Republic of South Africa declares that it does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(19) "The Kingdom of Spain declares, in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 17 of the Convention, that it does not consider itself bound by the procedure for the settlement of disputes stipulated in paragraph 2 of Article 17."

(20) "Turkey, in accordance with Article 17, paragraph 3 of the Convention does not consider itself bound by Article 17, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

(21) Indicates that reservation/declaration was subsequently withdrawn.

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 24 February 1988 (entered into force on 6 August 1989, in accordance with article VI, paragraph 1) a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification or Accession	Effective date
Argentina	24 February 1988	12 February 1992	13 March 1992
Australia		23 October 1990	22 November 1990
Austria	4 July 1989	28 December 1989	27 January 1990
Belarus	24 February 1988	1 May 1989	6 August 1989
Belgium	15 March 1989		
Brazil	24 February 1988		
Bulgaria	24 February 1988	26 March 1991	25 April 1991
Cameroon	23 November 1988		
Canada	24 February 1988	2 August 1993	1 September 1993
Central African Republic		1 July 1991	31 July 1991
Chile	24 February 1988	15 August 1989	14 September 1989
China	24 February 1988		
Congo	13 April 1989		
Costa Rica	24 February 1988		
Côte d'Ivoire	21 March 1988		
Czech Republic (1)		25 March 1993	1 January 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 April 1989		
Denmark (2)	24 February 1988	23 November 1989	23 December 1989
Egypt	24 February 1988		
Estonia		22 December 1993	21 January 1994
Ethiopia	24 February 1988		
Fiji		21 September 1992	21 October 1992
Finland	16 November 1988		
France (3)	29 March 1988	6 September 1989	6 October 1989
Gabon	20 September 1988		
Germany (4)	24 February 1988	25 April 1994	25 May 1994
Ghana	24 February 1988		
Greece	18 April 1988	25 April 1991	25 May 1991
Hungary	24 February 1988	7 September 1988	6 August 1989
Iceland	24 February 1988	9 May 1990	8 June 1990
Indonesia	24 February 1988		
Iraq		31 January 1990	2 March 1990
Ireland	29 July 1988	26 July 1991	25 August 1991
Israel	24 February 1988	2 April 1993	2 May 1993
Italy	24 February 1988	13 March 1990	12 April 1990
Jamaica	24 February 1988		
Jordan	30 September 1988	18 September 1992	18 October 1992
Kuwait (5)	24 February 1988	8 March 1989	6 August 1989
Lebanon	24 February 1988		
Liberia	24 February 1988		
Luxembourg	18 May 1989		
Malawi	24 February 1988		
Malaysia	24 February 1988		
Mali		31 October 1990	30 November 1990
Malta		14 June 1991	14 July 1991

---

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification or Accession	Effective date
Marshall Islands	23 June 1988	30 May 1989	6 August 1989
Mauritius	28 June 1989	17 August 1989	16 September 1989
Mexico	24 February 1988	11 October 1990	10 November 1990
Monaco		22 December 1993	21 January 1994
Morocco	8 July 1988		
Netherlands, Kingdom of the (6)	13 April 1988		
New Zealand	11 April 1989		
Niger	24 February 1988		
Norway	24 February 1988	29 May 1990	28 June 1990
		27 November 1992	27 December 1992
Oman			
Pakistan	24 February 1988		
Peru	24 February 1988	7 June 1989	6 August 1989
Philippines	25 January 1989		
Poland	24 February 1988		
Portugal	24 February 1988		
Republic of Korea	24 February 1988	27 June 1990	27 July 1990
Romania	24 February 1988		
Russian Federation	24 February 1988	31 March 1989	6 August 1989
		11 June 1990	11 July 1990
Saint Lucia			
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1 December 1988	29 November 1991	29 December 1991
Saudi Arabia	24 February 1988	21 February 1989	6 August 1989
Senegal	24 February 1988		
Slovenia (7)		27 May 1992	-
Spain	2 March 1989	8 May 1991	7 June 1991
Sri Lanka	28 October 1988		
Sweden	24 February 1988	26 July 1990	25 August 1990
Switzerland	24 February 1988	9 October 1990	8 November 1990
Togo	24 October 1988	9 February 1990	11 March 1990
Tunisia		7 June 1994	7 July 1994
Turkey	24 February 1988	7 July 1989	6 August 1989
Uganda		17 March 1994	16 April 1994
Ukraine	24 February 1988		
United Arab Emirates	24 February 1988	9 March 1989	6 August 1989
United Kingdom (8)	26 October 1988	15 November 1990	15 December 1990
United States	24 February 1988		
Uzbekistan		7 February 1994	9 March 1994
Venezuela	24 February 1988		
Yugoslavia*	24 February 1988	21 December 1989	20 January 1990
Zaire	24 February 1988		

---

* "Yugoslavia" refers to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(1) By a Note dated 8 March 1993, received on 25 March 1993, the Government of the Czech Republic informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that, as a successor State created as a result of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, it considered itself bound by the Protocol with effect from 1 January 1993.

(2) The Government of Denmark made the following reservation at the time of ratification of the Protocol: "Until later decision, the Protocol will not be applied to the Faroe Islands."

(3) The Government of France made the following declaration at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The French Republic recalls the declaration made at the time of its accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971, when it stated that: 'In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2, the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that Article under which any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation, shall at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.'"

The above declaration is applicable to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971."

In addition, the following declaration was made by that Government at the time of ratification:

"In depositing its instrument of ratification of the Protocol of 24 February 1988 for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation done at Montreal on 23 September 1971, the French Republic recalls and confirms the declaration made at the time of its accession to the said Convention, when it stated that: 'In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2, the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that Article under which any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation, shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If, within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.'

The above declaration is applicable to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971."

(4) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Protocol on 31 January 1989, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(5) It is understood that the ratification of this Protocol does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(6) The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands made the following interpretative statement at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that, in the light of the preamble, it understands the provisions laid down in Articles II and III of the Protocol to signify the following:

- only those acts which, in view of the nature of the weapons used and the place where they are committed, cause or are likely to cause incidental loss of life or serious injury among the general public or users of international civil aviation in particular, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 bis (a), as contained in Article II of the Protocol;

- only those acts which, in view of the damage which they cause to buildings or aircraft at the airport or their disruption of the services provided by the airport, endanger or are likely to endanger the safe operation of the airport in relation to international civil aviation, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph I bis (b), as contained in Article II of the Protocol."

(7) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovenia to the Protocol was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 27 May 1992.

(8) The Government of the United Kingdom made the following declaration at the time of ratification of the Protocol: "... the United Kingdom declares that until consultations with various territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom are completed, the Protocol will apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland only. Consultations with the territories are in hand and are expected to be completed by the end of 1991."

6. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 (entered into force on 1 March 1992) a/

States b/	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, accession, approval or acceptance	Date of entry into force
Argentina	10 March 1988	17 August 1993 (1)	15 November 1993
Australia		19 February 1993	20 May 1993
Austria	10 March 1988	28 December 1989	1 March 1992
Bahamas	10 March 1988		
Barbados		6 May 1994	4 August 1994
Belgium	9 March 1989		
Brazil	10 March 1988		
Brunei Darussalam	3 February 1989		
Bulgaria	10 March 1988		
Belarus	2 March 1989		
Canada	10 March 1988	18 June 1993	16 September 1993
Chile	10 March 1988 (2)	22 April 1994	21 July 1994
China	25 October 1988 '3)	20 August 1991	1 March 1992
Costa Rica	10 March 1988		
Denmark	26 October 1988		
Ecuador	10 March 1988		
Egypt	16 August 1988	8 January 1993 (4)	8 April 1993
Finland	18 November 1988		
France	10 March 1988	2 December 1991 (5)	1 March 1992
Gambia		1 November 1991	1 March 1992
Germany		6 November 1990 (6)	1 March 1992
Greece	10 March 1988	11 June 1993	9 September 1993
Hungary	10 March 1988	9 November 1989	1 March 1992
Iraq	17 October 1988 (7)		
Israel	10 March 1988		
Italy	10 March 1988	26 January 1990	1 March 1992
Jordan	10 March 1988		
Liberia	10 March 1988		
Mexico		13 May 1994 (8)	11 August 1994
Morocco	10 March 1988		
Netherlands	23 January 1989	5 March 1992	3 June 1992
New Zealand	8 December 1988		
Nigeria	9 September 1988		
Norway	10 March 1988	18 April 1991	1 March 1992
Oman		24 September 1990	1 March 1992
Philippines	10 March 1988		
Poland	22 November 1988	25 June 1991	1 March 1992
Romania		2 June 1993	31 August 1993
Russian Federation	2 March 1989		
Saudi Arabia	6 March 1989		
Seychelles	24 January 1989	24 January 1989	1 March 1992
Spain	28 September 1988	7 July 1989	1 March 1992
Sweden	10 March 1988	13 September 1990	1 March 1992
Switzerland	10 March 1988	12 March 1993	10 June 1993
Trinidad and Tobago		27 July 1989	1 March 1992
Turkey	10 March 1988 (9)		
Ukraine	2 March 1989	21 April 1994	20 July 1994

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Maritime Organization.

b/ Czechoslovakia, which had signed the Convention on 9 March 1989, was dissolved on 31 December 1992.

States b/	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, accession, approval or acceptance	Date of entry into force
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 September 1988	3 May 1991 (10)	1 March 1992
United States of America	10 March 1988		

(1) The instrument of ratification contained the following reservation:

"The Argentine Republic declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it shall not be bound by any of the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article."

(2) The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

"In connection with the provisions of article 4 of the present Convention, the Government of Chile shall not apply the provisions thereof to incidents that occur in its internal waters and in the waters of Magellan Strait."

(3) The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Convention and reaffirmed upon ratification:

"The People's Republic of China is not bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 of the Convention."

(4) The following reservations were made at the time of ratification of the Convention:

"1. A reservation is made to article 16 on the peaceful settlement of disputes because it provides for the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and also with regard to the application of the Convention to seagoing ships in internal waters which are scheduled to navigate beyond territorial waters.

"2. A reservation is made to article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention and article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol because those articles permit the optional jurisdiction of blackmailed States (which are asked by the perpetrator of an act of terrorism to do or abstain from doing any act).

"This is in compliance with the provision of paragraph 4 of each of the two articles."

(5) The instrument of approval contained the following declarations:

"1. As far as article 3, paragraph 2, is concerned the French Republic understands by 'tentative', 'incitation', 'complicité' and 'menace', la tentative, l'incitation, la complicité and la menace as defined in the conditions envisaged by French criminal law.

"2. The French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, according to which: 'Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation within a reasonable time shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If, within six months from the date of the request for arbitration, the parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration any one of those parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court'."

(6) On 3 October 1990 the German Democratic Republic acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 14 April 1989.

(7) The following reservation was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

"This signature does not in any way imply recognition of Israel or entry into any relationship with it."

(8) The instrument of accession of Mexico contained the following reservation:

"Mexico's accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, 1988, and to its Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, 1988, is on the understanding that in matters relating to extradition, both article 11 of the Convention and article 3 of the Protocol will be applied in the Republic of Mexico subject to the modalities and procedures laid down in the applicable provisions of national law."

(9) Reservation to the effect that Turkey does not consider itself bound by all of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1.

(10) The instrument of ratification was accompanied by the following declaration:

"... that until consultations with various territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom are completed, the Convention and Protocol will apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland only. Consultations with the territories are in hand and are expected to be completed by the end of 1991."

7. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 (entered into force on 1 March 1992) a/

States b/	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, accession, approval or acceptance	Date of entry into force
Argentina	10 March 1988		
Australia		19 February 1993	20 May 1993
Austria		28 December 1989	1 March 1992
Bahamas	10 March 1988		
Barbados		6 May 1994	4 August 1994
Belgium	9 March 1989		
Brazil	10 March 1988		
Brunei Darussalam	3 February 1989		
Bulgaria	10 March 1988		
Belarus	2 March 1989		
Canada	10 March 1988	18 June 1993	16 September 1993
Chile	10 March 1988	22 April 1994	21 July 1994
China	25 October 1988 (1)	20 August 1991	1 March 1992
Costa Rica	10 March 1988		
Denmark	26 October 1988		
Ecuador	10 March 1988		
Egypt	16 August 1988	8 January 1993 (2)	8 April 1993
France	10 March 1988	2 December 1991 (3)	1 March 1992
Germany		6 November 1990 (4)	1 March 1992
Greece	10 March 1988	11 June 1993	9 September 1993
Hungary	10 March 1988	9 November 1989	1 March 1992
Iraq	17 October 1988 (5)		
Israel	10 March 1988		
Italy	10 March 1988	26 January 1990	1 March 1992
Jordan	10 March 1988		
Liberia	10 March 1988		
Mexico		13 May 1994 (6)	11 August 1994
Morocco	10 March 1988		
Netherlands	23 January 1989	5 March 1992 (7)	3 June 1992
New Zealand	8 December 1988		
Nigeria	9 September 1988		
Norway	10 March 1988	18 April 1991	1 March 1992
Oman		24 September 1990	1 March 1992
Philippines	10 March 1988		
Poland	22 November 1988	25 June 1991	1 March 1992
Romania		2 June 1993	31 August 1992
Russian Federation	2 March 1989		
Saudi Arabia	6 March 1989		
Seychelles	24 January 1989	24 January 1989	1 March 1992
Spain	28 September 1988	7 July 1989	1 March 1992
Sweden	10 March 1988	13 September 1990	1 March 1992
Switzerland	27 February 1989	12 March 1993	10 June 1993

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Maritime Organization.

b/ Czechoslovakia, which had signed the Protocol on 9 March 1989, was dissolved on 31 December 1992.

States b/	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, accession, approval or acceptance	Date of entry into force
Trinidad and Tobago		27 July 1989	1 March 1992
Turkey	10 March 1988 (8)		
Ukraine	2 March 1989	21 April 1994	20 July 1994
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 September 1988	3 May 1991 (9)	1 March 1992
United States of America	10 March 1988		

(1) The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Protocol and reaffirmed upon ratification:

"The People's Republic of China is not bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 of the Convention."

(2) The following reservations were made at the time of ratification of the Protocol:

"1. A reservation is made to article 16 on the peaceful settlement of disputes because it provides for the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and also with regard to the application of the Convention to seagoing ships in internal waters which are scheduled to navigate beyond territorial waters.

"2. A reservation is made to article 6, paragraph 2 of the Convention and article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol because those articles permit the optional jurisdiction of blackmailed States (which are asked by the perpetrator of an act of terrorism to do or abstain from doing any act).

"This is in compliance with the provision of paragraph 4 of each of the two articles."

(3) The instrument of approval contained the following declarations:

"1. As far as article 2, paragraph 2, is concerned the French Republic understands by 'tentative', 'incitation', 'complicité' and 'menace', La tentative, l'incitation, la complicité and la menace as defined in the conditions envisaged by French criminal law.

"2. The French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 1, paragraph 1, to the extent that reference is made to the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, according to which: 'Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation within a reasonable time shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If, within six months from the date of the request for arbitration, the parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration any one of those parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court'."

(4) On 3 October 1990 the German Democratic Republic acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 14 April 1989.

(5) The following reservation was made at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"This signature does not in any way imply recognition of Israel or entry into any relationship with it."

(6) The instrument of accession of Mexico contained the following reservation:

"Mexico's accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, 1988, and to its Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, 1988, is on the understanding that in matters relating to extradition, both article 11 of the Convention and article 3 of

the Protocol will be applied in the Republic of Mexico subject to the modalities and procedures laid down in the applicable provisions of national law."

(7) The instrument of acceptance contained the following reservation:

"With regard to the obligation laid down in article 1 of the Protocol in conjunction with article 10 of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation to exercise jurisdiction in cases where the judicial authorities of the Netherlands cannot exercise jurisdiction on any of the grounds referred to in article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the right to be bound to exercise such jurisdiction only after the Kingdom has received and rejected a request for extradition from a State Party".

(8) Reservation to the effect that Turkey does not consider itself bound by all of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

(9) The instrument of ratification was accompanied by the following declaration:

"... that until consultations with various territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom are completed, the Convention and Protocol will apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland only. Consultations with the territories are in hand and are expected to be completed by the end of 1991."

8. Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection, signed at Montreal on 1 March 1991 a/

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval accession or succession	Effective date
Afghanistan	1 March 1991		
Argentina	1 March 1991		
Belarus	1 March 1991		
Belgium	1 March 1991		
Belize	1 March 1991		
Bolivia	1 March 1991		
Brazil (1)	1 March 1991		
Bulgaria	26 March 1991		
Canada	1 March 1991		
Chile	1 March 1991		
Colombia	13 December 1991		
Costa Rica	1 March 1991		
Côte d'Ivoire	1 March 1991		
Czech Republic (2)(3)		25 March 1993	
Denmark	1 March 1991		
Ecuador	1 March 1991		
Egypt	1 March 1991	19 July 1993	
Finland	25 March 1993		
France	1 March 1991		
Gabon	1 March 1991		
Germany	1 March 1991		
Ghana	1 March 1991		
Greece	1 March 1991		
Guinea	1 March 1991		
Guinea-Bissau	1 March 1991		
Honduras (1)	26 March 1991		
Hungary	30 October 1992	11 January 1994	
Israel	1 March 1991		
Jordan	17 July 1992		
Kuwait	1 March 1991		
Lebanon	1 March 1991		
Madagascar	1 March 1991		
Mali	1 March 1991		
Mauritius	1 March 1991		
Mexico	1 March 1991	9 April 1992	
Netherlands	2 August 1991		
Norway (2)	1 March 1991	9 July 1992	
Pakistan	1 March 1991		
Peru (1)	1 March 1991		
Republic of Korea	1 March 1991		
Russian Federation	1 March 1991		
Senegal	1 March 1991		
Spain (2)	5 April 1993	31 May 1994	
Sweden	13 November 1992		
Switzerland	1 March 1991		
Togo	1 March 1991		
Turkey (1)	7 May 1991		
Ukraine	1 March 1991		

a/ The information concerning this Convention is reproduced below as furnished on 20 June 1994 by the secretariat of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

States	Date of signature	Date of deposit of instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval accession or succession	Effective date
United Arab Emirates		21 December 1992	
United States of America	1 March 1991		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1 March 1991		

(1) Reservation: Does not consider itself bound by Article XI, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

(2) Declaration, in accordance with Article XIII, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it is a producer State.

(3) By a Note dated 8 March 1993, received on 25 March 1993, the Government of the Czech Republic informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that, as a successor State created as a result of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, it considered itself bound, as at 1 January 1993, by the Convention. The declaration made by the former Czech and Slovak Federal Republic in accordance with Article XIII, paragraph 2, thereof continues in force for the Czech Republic (see footnote 2).

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/257/Add.1
2 September 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC/ENGLISH

Forty-ninth session
Item 145 of the provisional agenda*

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Report of the Secretary-General

Addendum

CONTENTS

Page

II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM MEMBER STATES

Brunei Darussalam 2

Sri Lanka 2

Syrian Arab Republic 4

* A/49/150.

94-35143 (E) 150994 190994

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

[Original: English]

[4 August 1994]

1. Brunei Darussalam fully supports the efforts of the United Nations to eliminate terrorism.

2. Brunei Darussalam recognizes the threat that terrorism poses to regional and international security.

3. There is a necessity to convene an international conference to discuss all aspects of terrorism.

4. There are several legal and other issues which need to be discussed and resolved so that international cooperation may be enhanced.

5. Brunei Darussalam has shown its concern about terrorism by signing several international conventions relating to the security of civil aviation and the security of maritime navigation.

SRI LANKA

[Original: English]

[15 July 1994]

1. The Government of Sri Lanka attaches great importance to the practical implementation of General Assembly resolutions on measures to eliminate international terrorism, including resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991.

2. Manifestations of terrorism that involve an external factor or the presence of a foreign element pose a grave threat to the security, stability, political independence and territorial integrity of States, in particular small States.

3. Measures to combat international terrorism should, therefore, specifically focus on:

(a) The organization, instigation and assisting of terrorist acts from foreign territories directed at third States;

(b) The combating of terrorist acts within one State and seeking safe haven within a foreign State;

(c) The condoning of activities, including fund-raising and the provision of arms and training, which have the effect of sustaining or encouraging terrorism in other States.

4. In this context Sri Lanka welcomes General Assembly resolutions 44/29 and 46/51, and decision 48/411 which unequivocally condemn, as criminal and

non-justifiable, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed, and which call upon States, inter alia, to fulfil their obligations under international law by refraining from organizing, instigating, assisting, participating in, encouraging or acquiescing in terrorist activities or in the preparation of such activities, and to adhere to their obligations under international conventions in the field of terrorism to prosecute or extradite offenders and to cooperate on the apprehension and prosecution of such offenders.

5. Sri Lanka supports the wide adherence to the existing international conventions on specific aspects of terrorism so as to deprive any safe haven to terrorist offenders. Sri Lanka is a party to the Tokyo, The Hague and Montreal conventions on offenses committed on board aircraft, the unlawful seizure of aircraft and the safety of civil aviation, and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents. Sri Lanka is also examining the possibility of early accession to other conventions on specific aspects of terrorism.

6. The Government of Sri Lanka is of the view that the role of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in combating terrorism could be enhanced by examining and dealing with the disturbing dimensions of the linkage between the illicit arms trade, trafficking in narcotics and the activities of terrorist groups. The transfer of illicit arms to terrorist groups, particularly through funds generated from drug trafficking, pose a real danger to the security and stability of States and also to regional and international security. It also undermines attempts to negotiate political solutions to internal or international conflicts. The alarming dimensions of this dangerous nexus between the illicit arms trade, narcotic trafficking and the activities of terrorist groups requires high priority in devising practical measures to eliminate acts of terrorism.

7. The United Nations could play a central coordinating role in achieving transparency over illicit arms transfers. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, for instance, could collect and process information on such illicit transfers, thereby helping to identify more clearly illicit arms transfers to terrorist groups. This mechanism should be backed up by greater cooperation between law enforcement and customs agencies of Member States, both at the international and regional level.

8. Similar attention must be given to the gross violation of human rights perpetrated by terrorist groups. Sri Lanka has been a victim of gross violation of human rights perpetrated by violent terrorist groups. Indiscriminate and random acts of violence and terror by these groups have resulted in death and injury caused to innocent persons, including women and children. Seriously concerned with the increase of these activities, Sri Lanka co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 48/122 on human rights and terrorism, which unequivocally condemned gross violation of human rights by terrorist groups.

9. The Government of Sri Lanka has also brought to the attention of the international community and relevant organizations of the United Nations system, the violent campaign of terror unleashed by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil

Eeelam (LTTE), a terrorist group seeking to establish a mono-ethnic state in the northern and eastern provinces of Sri Lanka. The activities of the group have resulted in gross violation of human rights, including the right to life of the Sinhalese, Tamil and Muslim people of Sri Lanka. The group has also extended its activities beyond the territory of Sri Lanka and their harmful effects have been felt in neighbouring and other countries.

10. The Government of Sri Lanka is also committed to the creation of a cooperative regime at the regional level to combat terrorism as it affects the security and stability of the region. The need for such a regime is imperative in the context of the external linkages of terrorist groups and would supplement measures at the international level to counter the threat of terrorism.

11. Sri Lanka thus took the initiative within the regional forum of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to negotiate and conclude the SAARC Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism. The SAARC Convention entered into force on 22 August 1988, after ratification by all member States of SAARC. Sri Lanka has also enacted the SAARC Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism Act No. 70 of 1988 to give effect, at the national level, to its obligations under the Convention.

12. Sri Lanka has constantly stressed within the SAARC forum the need for the rapid and effective exchange of information among concerned agencies of Member States to prevent acts of terrorism through precautionary measures. It therefore hosted several meetings of experts in the field on the creation of a regional network of exchange of information relating to activities of terrorist groups. Sri Lanka has also offered to host a permanent liaison unit to work as a data bank and an information dissemination centre focusing, inter alia, on the nature and trends of terrorist activities, as well as strategies and methods relating to terrorism in the region. This would facilitate the formulation of an appropriate strategy to combat the threat of terrorism at the regional level. This proposal has been recommended by the experts for consideration by the SAARC Council of Ministers.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

[Original: Arabic]

[18 July 1994]

1. The Syrian Arab Republic reiterates its condemnation of all manifestations of terrorism as criminal acts that target the lives and property of innocent people and violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. It calls for genuine cooperation between all States in accordance with international law in taking the steps necessary to combat and prevent terrorism and eliminate its underlying causes. It also calls for the elaboration of internationally acceptable criteria to differentiate clearly between terrorism, which must be condemned and eliminated, and the struggle of peoples for national liberation, which must be protected and supported.

2. The Syrian Arab Republic therefore welcomed the historic General Assembly resolution 42/159, which represented an important step in expanding and encouraging effective cooperation to combat terrorism in accordance with international law and on the basis of the principles mentioned in paragraph 14 of that resolution and derived from the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States.

3. The Syrian Arab Republic was among the first to call for the convening of an international conference to define terrorism, explore its causes and differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation from foreign occupation and to study the underlying cause of those acts of violence, which lie in the violation of those peoples' basic rights and in misery, frustration, grievance and despair. The Syrian Arab Republic considers that any working group to be established should concentrate its efforts on preparations for convening an international conference to define terrorism and study means of eliminating it, and in the light of the results of that conference it may be possible to draft an international convention on the prevention of terrorism.

4. The Syrian Arab Republic appreciates the efforts made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to seek the views of Member States on convening the international conference in question in accordance with the relevant General Assembly resolutions. Its position is based on its concern to uphold international legitimacy, the principles of international law and the purposes and principles of the Charter. It is of the view that the General Assembly should consider the item entitled "Measures to eliminate international terrorism" on a biennial basis in order to review ways and means of enhancing the role of the United Nations and the relevant specialized agencies in combating international terrorism.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/257/Add.2
4 October 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Forty-ninth session
Agenda item 142

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Report of the Secretary-General

Addendum

CONTENTS

Page

II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM MEMBER STATES

Mauritius 2

MAURITIUS

[Original: English]

[15 September 1994]

1. The Government of the Republic of Mauritius wishes to record its full support for United Nations efforts concerning measures to eliminate international terrorism.

2. Mauritius reaffirms its full support for General Assembly decision 48/411 of 9 December 1993 on the holding of an international conference on the elimination of terrorism.

3. While acknowledging that it is difficult to reach a concerted definition of international terrorism, the Government of Mauritius encourages the laudable move of the United Nations and the International Law Commission in proposing one to the world community. We opine that a definition of international terrorism should include, inter alia, violence as a result of the drug trafficking undertaken by international smugglers, and also help and any logistic support in the escalation of local terrorism.

4. The Government of Mauritius, conscious of the existence of several conventions to combat terrorism at both the national and the international level, is in favour of a codification of these offences in the interpretation of international terrorism.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/257/Add.3
19 October 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

Forty-ninth session
Agenda item 142

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Report of the Secretary-General

Addendum

CONTENTS

Page

II. REPLIES RECEIVED FROM MEMBER STATES

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 2

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

[Original: Arabic]

[17 October 1994]

1. There can be no doubt that terrorism is a serious menace to all mankind, endangering and destroying the lives of innocent people, spreading disorder, undermining trust in relations between nations and posing a threat to international peace and security.

2. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which was a victim of terrorism in 1973 and 1986 and remains a target of terrorist activities, condemns international terrorism in all its forms. It shares the conviction of the international community that this pernicious phenomenon and all its various practices and manifestations must be fought. On numerous occasions, it has expressed deep concern at the spread of international terrorism and has constantly urged the need to fight it. It has declared that it will not permit its territory, its nationals or its institutions to be used, directly or indirectly, for the perpetration of acts of terrorism and that it will impose penalties on those proved to have been involved in such acts. It has also declared that there are no camps for the training of terrorists in its territory, and it has repeatedly invited the Security Council or any international body designated by it to verify this fact.

3. The Jamahiriya has supported all the resolutions of the General Assembly condemning international terrorism and has acceded to most of the relevant international conventions, such as the Tokyo, Hague and Montreal conventions on the safety of civil aviation.

4. As an indication of its genuine desire for the elimination of international terrorism as a danger to international peace and security, the Jamahiriya has called for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to the subject and has supported the convening of an international conference under United Nations auspices in order to establish a clear definition of international terrorism, including State terrorism, to consider the root causes of the exacerbation of a grave phenomenon that has confronted us for many decades and thus to eliminate the underlying causes of all the forms of terrorism and acts of violence with which the world is afflicted. The approach of the United Nations in addressing the question of terrorism and its causes must be based on the establishment of a clear methodology that enjoys general international acceptance, given that the absence of a clear definition of the term "international terrorism" and its confusion with the right of peoples to exercise self-determination and to defend themselves has enabled some to use it as a propaganda weapon to the detriment of a number of countries that support the just struggle of peoples for sovereignty, independence and self-determination.

5. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, immediately on learning of the Pan Am flight 103 incident and the UTA incident, announced its condemnation of the perpetrators and its sympathy with the families of the victims. When France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America made allegations that two

Libyan nationals were connected with the incidents, the Libyan judicial authorities took all possible measures to bring the truth to light. Given the legal character of the dispute, the Jamahiriya referred the matter to the International Court of Justice and it remains before the Court. Moreover, in its desire for a speedy resolution to the dispute, the Jamahiriya has from the outset shown sufficient flexibility for a settlement. It continues to make earnest endeavours to resolve the matter fairly and in accordance with international law and custom. In this connection, it has announced its readiness to accept many proposals, most recently that of the League of Arab States that the two suspected of involvement in the Pan Am flight 103 incident should be tried by a Scottish court and under Scots law at the seat of the International Court of Justice.

6. The Jamahiriya is prompted by the hope that the international community will be able to address the causes of international terrorism and to eliminate it. It once more affirms its readiness to participate in international efforts to study all proposals for the elimination of terrorism and to devise appropriate legal means for the punishment of offenders.